

1                                   **WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA**  
2                                   **SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL**

3  
4  
5                                   **VOLUME II**  
6                                   **PUBLIC MEETING**  
7                                   February 24th, 1995  
8                                   Community Center  
9                                   9:00 o'clock a.m.  
10                                  Huslia, Alaska  
11  
12

**COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

14  
15   **HAROLD HUNTINGTON, CHAIRMAN**  
16   **RAYMOND COLLINS, VICE CHAIRMAN**  
17   **SHARON GURTLE-STRICK, MEMBER**  
18   **HENRY DEACON, MEMBER**  
19   **PHILLIP GRAHAM, MEMBER**  
20   **POLLOCK SIMON, SR., MEMBER**  
21   **JACK REAKOFF, MEMBER**  
22   **HERMAN MORGAN, MEMBER**

23  
24  
25   **Vince Mathews, Coordinator**

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

**R & R COURT REPORTERS**

810 N STREET                   1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982       272-7515

PROCEEDINGS

(On record; 9:25 o'clock a.m.)

MR. HUNTINGTON: Good morning, everybody. I'd like to reconvene our meeting at 9:25. I'll call the meeting back to order. First of all, are there any announcements anybody needs to make today? (Pause) Hearing none, we'll go on with the agenda.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the next thing on the agenda, where we ended on last night was 8(E) which is the status of navigable waters and fisheries management and, in particular, what's called the NARC Petition. If you'd like, I can go into that.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The council members and others that have a copy of this book, the NARC Petition, and there's other hand-outs -- for those that -- I know that it's mostly staff here. I will be saying on the record that there's copies for the public because I never know when public is coming and going. There copies of that petition under Tab 7 and there's copies over there on the public table. So, if you want to go to tab 7, I'm going to summarize the Federal Register notice and, essentially, this is asking you, as a council, to comment on this petition. Okay. And the petition has been named the NARC Petition. But the NARC Petition stands for the Northwest Arctic Regional Council, which is your sister or brother council, along with others on the full petition. On the back of the Federal Register which is the one with the columns, newspaper style, is the full petition. If you want to look at that, you're free to do that. But it's summarized under the Federal Register. Okay.

The NARC Petition, again, was Northwest Arctic Regional Council and other Native groups which is requesting the secretaries, which means the Secretary of Interior and Agriculture to (1) establish that they, meaning the secretaries, have authority to regulate hunting and fishing on Non-Public lands, to protect subsistence priority afforded on public lands by Title 8 of ANILCA. That's saying the program that you are part of and advisory to only affects Federal land. This is saying it should go beyond that. That's No. 1; No. 2 that determine that land selected but not conveyed to Native corporations in the State of Alaska be treated as Public lands subject to ANILCA subsistence priority. So, as you know, there's over-selections by the State and by Native corporations

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

to fulfill the 104-plus million acres to the State and the 44  
to the 45 million for the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

3

4

5

The comments must be submitted which is to the  
Associate regional director for Fish and Wildlife, Richard  
Pospahala, by April 3rd. Now, the key terms that are being  
discussed here are what is considered Public Land or non-Public  
Land and then the selected-but-not-conveyed. So, if you'd look  
on the Federal Register notice, the one that's in newspaper  
column, the far right lower column, I'll just be kind of  
summarizing that. The subsistence preference as established in  
804 in ANILCA accords priority in the taking of fish and  
Wildlife for non-wasteful subsistence uses on Public lands.  
And Public lands are defined in Section 102 of ANILCA, and I do  
have a copy of ANILCA, and this does match it. It is defined  
in 102 to mean lands, waters, and interests therein that are  
situated in Alaska and to which the United States hold title to  
except for (1) lands selected by the State of Alaska that  
have been tentatively approved and validly selected or granted  
to the Territory of Alaska. (2) is land selected for Native  
Corporations made under ANCSA, or Alaska Native Claims  
Settlement Act, that have not been conveyed; and (3) refers to  
lands referred to in the Native Claims Settlement Act.

25

26

When this program was established, I believe that was  
discussed quite a bit as to what jurisdiction this program  
would extend to and so it was promulgated that the Federal  
Subsistence Regulations and the secretaries took the position  
that most navigable waters and lands selected but not conveyed  
to State and Native corporations are not subject to 804  
preference. The petition is summarized a little bit below that  
and it's saying they seek a rule-making to reverse or clarify  
the position, the position that State and selected lands are  
not part of it, and that they request an interpretive rule be  
promulgated that states the Federal government has authority to  
regulate hunting and fishing on non-Public lands and an  
interpretive rule be promulgated that places selected but not  
conveyed are within the purview of this. Their justification  
for their petition relies upon law established in the  
contiguous 48 states that establishes Federal authority to  
regulate activities on non-Federal lands to protect activities  
on Federal lands. I think we can give further explanation on  
that if you need it, but there are some suits in the Lower 48  
that made the position that Federal jurisdiction goes beyond  
Federal lands. And the following support is also the Property  
Clause of the Constitution, and Federal law preempts State law.

48

49

50

So, this petition was sent to the Secretaries of

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Interior and Agriculture. They have decided to put out on Federal Register for public comment on their feelings on this petition. So it's kind of before you to decide if you agree with the petition or disagree with the petition or parts of the petition you can accept. And I think that's about the best I can do in explaining this. Does everyone kind of understand where we're going with this? There's others here that can kind of help out on this, but it's a very important petition depending -- well, it's an important petition no matter where you stand on subsistence because if the petition was adopted then our jurisdiction on different species would extend beyond the colored blocks on the map that you have and it would be a case-by-case situation. If you agree to the petition part that it would go to selected-but-not-conveyed, then this map is not going to help you because I don't think they're marked on there. But you would have blocks of land that would be under one set of regulations, potentially surrounded by other lands that are not of the same regulations.

19

20 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman?

21

22 MR. HUNTINGTON: Ray?

23

24 MR. COLLINS: This petition came before the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission. I'll give you an example in that area of how it impacts them because it had been a concern there before. When Denali Park was extended, new Park lands -- and, of course, that was closed to hunting except for local subsistence hunters; they still have hunting rights in that extension. But some of the land within there was selected by the Cantwell corporation, so there's inholding lands that in the Park. It's not open under a State season because it's in the Park and because it has been tentatively conveyed, it's not open under the subsistence hunting for the Park, either. So, nobody can hunt on some of the prime land right inside the Park and this would enable them to extend jurisdiction over that, Federally, and open to hunting. That's one example. But I think the position they took at the meeting was they thought that if this was used, it ought to be selected and not blanket across the State. It should be kind of a case-by-case. That's....

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we do have the person who  
44 like the coordinator for Denali SRC.

45

46 MR. COLLINS: Right.

47

48 MR. MATHEWS: But I attended that meeting and they  
49 supported the position that, like Ray laid out, that within the  
50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

conservation unit, if there are selected lands,....

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Right.

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: ....that the priority in 804 should  
6 apply, but beyond that they did not support it.

7

8 MR. COLLINS: Right.

9

10 MR. MATHEWS: I think Hollis can validate that, that  
11 they didn't support going beyond Federal lands and they didn't  
12 support selected-but-not-conveyed lands outside the  
13 conservation unit boundaries.

14

15 MR. COLLINS: Right. Yeah, I may have misspoke.  
16 That's what I was attempting to say.

17

18 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman?

19

20 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, Herman?

21

22 MR. MORGAN: I'd like to make some comments on that.  
23 It seems like if we get the Federal government to control the  
24 lands and stuff, you know, like right now in the paper they're  
25 voting on it in Washington, you know, to -- no new regulations,  
26 you know, that'll affect us, you know. And this wolf control  
27 problem we're having, it seems like if we go with the  
28 Federal -- wolf control on Federal, you know, a lot of the  
29 decisions will be made by them people down in the States and  
30 they'll say you can't do this and you can't do that and that's  
31 the problem I see, you know, with that. And right now, I'd  
32 rather see them control their own, you know, even though a lot  
33 of times the State -- they don't get along, you know, still  
34 we're here and we're -- we can see the problem, you know.  
35 Whereas if we go to Federal, a lot of times they'll make the  
36 rules for us and there's nothing we can do about it.

37

38 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, what he mentioned there,  
39 maybe some didn't see in the papers, that in Congress now  
40 there's movement to have a moratorium on any regulations for a  
41 year. If that was to pass, then, what we're doing today in the  
42 Federal Subsistence Board would not go to full cycle. But it's  
43 early in that whole moratorium thing that there may be  
44 exemptions to the subsistence process. So I've not gotten any  
45 directive from my supervisors, but I'm under the assumption we  
46 will continue to go on with this process until we're told for  
47 sure that that moratorium would go into effect. And further  
48 clarification on non-Federal lands and that, it would be -- a  
49 good example would be a caribou herd. If subsistence needs are

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

not being met within the Federal jurisdiction as it is now, potentially because of seasons and harvest limits outside that, if this petition passed, then the Federal government would assert its authority outside Federal lands and say that "X" seasons or harvest limits would have to be changed to protect the interests of subsistence within. But it is correct, it would be subject to -- it would become more of a national program than a -- subject to the interests of national interests versus the State which is more subject to State interests.

11

12 MR. DEACON: Mr. Chairman?

13

14 MR. HUNTINGTON: Henry?

15

16 MR. DEACON: I don't understand all that stuff that's talked about. Ray brought up something. I'm from Lower Yukon area. I don't know whether it's affecting that part, but how will it affect us is what I'm thinking about in our area, my area. And under the land claim act, there's something that's a Federal -- I like that part where the Federal has some -- has protection over the Native people in villages. I like that part of it. But the State part, I question all the time because they look at overall system; they don't care what -- they just -- those are the things I like to study or somebody should study. I can't study because I don't know how to read that good. But those are concerns I have for our part of the country here. You know, it's just -- I don't know how to -- we should have some kind of plan to go by that for our area.

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: I sense you're directing the question to me. What would happen if this passed? You would have a more complex matrix of land jurisdictions than presently on here. That complicates and in some ways ties the hands of the managers, both sides of the fence. The other thing is that if that was to pass, then, those lands and the resources that may be threatened by outside uses would be directly tied to 804 priority. And I think I need to state that presently under the State system it's all Alaskans qualify for subsistence and under Federal it's qualified rural residents. It -- you know, it's a complex thing, but the petition is bringing these questions to a head. At the same time, the 9th Circuit Court with the Katie John case and other cases are asking similar questions, also: who, where, and where to?

45

46 MR. COLLINS: Question. Let's see if I understand it clearly, I think, and, Henry, how it affects you in your area, that there probably are inholdings within Innoko Wildlife Refuge down there. Do some of the Village corporation lands

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

fall inside that in allotments?

2

3 MR. DEACON: No. On the edge.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: Oh, they're on the edge. Okay. But  
6 there are some allotments within there. Well, those  
7 allotments, now, you can't hunt on them during the winter  
8 season because it's been tentatively conveyed. And they --  
9 what they're trying -- one of the impacts would be that all the  
10 land within that boundary, then, they could have these Federal  
11 seasons apply to them. But if they wanted to go beyond that --  
12 they wanted to go on lands even outside, your corporation land  
13 outside and open that up to hunting, too, for subsistence  
14 purposes.

15

16 MR. DEACON: And include all outsiders?

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Well, under Federal, it'd have to be  
19 under the Federal subsistence season. The land outside now is  
20 under State jurisdiction. But the folks at Denali wanted to  
21 deal -- wanted it to be -- to apply to those within the Park,  
22 not those outside the Park. That's the stand that the  
23 local people took over there.

24

25 MR. HUNTINGTON: Phil, go ahead.

26

27 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah, I'm kind of confused, too. Around  
28 Lime Village, I have to look around our place, it used to be  
29 surrounded by Federal land and the State has selected land  
30 around Lime Village. If we pass this, does this mean that this  
31 State-selected land would be under Federal jurisdiction? Is  
32 that what the -- am I -- and does it mean Native allotments  
33 which are now under State jurisdiction would be....no?

34

35 MR. MATHEWS: No, because it's selected but not  
36 conveyed. Allotments are already fee-title, if that's the  
37 correct term.

38

39 MR. GRAHAM: Right.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: So, allotments it would not, but the  
42 selected lands, if the State -- if they've not been conveyed  
43 then would fall under Federal management. And then if they  
44 were finally then given to the State, then they would fall back  
45 again to State regulations.

46

47 MR. GRAHAM: So, when you say the map would be more  
48 complicated, it seems like we would be going back to a map that  
49 showed a lot of Federal land around Lime Village two, three

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

years ago before the State selection.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: But I'm going to defer to Mike on that  
4 because I don't know the make-up around Lime Village, but I  
5 believe you're correct.

6

7 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman. Phil, I think you're right  
8 on target. What you would see is, is you would have -- there  
9 would be more lands in the example of Lime Village that would  
10 be under Federal jurisdiction than State jurisdiction now. And  
11 let me clarify that. When the State selected lands around Lime  
12 Village, because of the way the Department of Interior and  
13 Department of Agriculture were reading the policy in the  
14 regulations, those selected lands then they came under the  
15 jurisdiction of the State of Alaska. So, State regulations  
16 applied on those selected lands. But if this NARC Petition was  
17 adopted, essentially, that jurisdiction would fall back into  
18 the Federal jurisdiction as it was before until those lands are  
19 fully conveyed. Okay? I guess another element I want to  
20 mention, one has to do with selected-but-not-conveyed lands,  
21 but the second element has to do with regardless of whose lands  
22 they are, be they Native allotments, corporation lands, or  
23 State lands, another element of the NARC Petition asks that in  
24 instances where in order to protect and provide for subsistence  
25 uses on Federal land and in a general area, that Federal  
26 jurisdiction could be extended to non-Federal Public lands,  
27 the State lands or corporation lands, when necessary to  
28 provide the priority as described in ANILCA.

29

30 MR. GRAHAM: And is that what you mean by the case-by-  
31 case basis? Is that in this petition, too?

32

33 MR. COFFING: No, that's not. That's something that  
34 Ray and Vince mentioned that the Denali Park Commission had  
35 talked about doing. When they looked at it, it sounds to me  
36 like they said, well, we like parts of it, but we don't want  
37 ....

38

39 MR. GRAHAM: Oh.

40

41 MR. COFFING: ....but we don't want it to apply  
42 blanket-wide for all selected lands.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: And also the -- if this was to pass, it  
45 wouldn't mean automatically that the Federal program would take  
46 over management on State lands. It would be, like he said, a  
47 resource problem for Federally qualified subsistence users.  
48 Then, the Federal Board would have the authority then to step  
49 outside of Federal land and take action.

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



1  
2 MR.GRAHAM: I just have a few more -- you know, I mean,  
3 that seems like you're getting in the -- it'll turn into a  
4 legal battle between the State and the Federal -- another legal  
5 battle.

6  
7 MR. REAKOFF: A big one.

8  
9 MR.GRAHAM: And let me just add one more thing. I  
10 don't really understand the whole thing, but if it means -- I  
11 have to agree with Henry. It seems like the Federal program is  
12 more sensitive to subsistence users. The program is designed  
13 for subsistence people, and I don't want people in Washington,  
14 D.C., you know, making up rules for us, but that's what I see  
15 for position here. It seems like we have a lot more clout than  
16 the State advisory committees do. So, I'm not worried about  
17 Federal jurisdiction on these lands. In fact, I think we're --  
18 the village people are better off, but I don't understand the  
19 whole issue, either.

20  
21 MR. HUNTINGTON: Hollis? You have a question?

22  
23 MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell. I'm with Denali  
24 National Park. Maybe I can help clarify what the Denali  
25 Subsistence Resource Commission recommendation was. On  
26 National Park lands, there is only the Federal subsistence  
27 program. There is no alternative State, sport or general hunt.  
28 So, on National Park lands where you have selected lands  
29 within a National Park boundary, currently there is no Federal  
30 Title 8 subsistence allowed on those lands. So that Native  
31 Corporations or on State-selected lands, there's no opportunity  
32 for the subsistence users to engage in subsistence hunting,  
33 trapping, and fishing. That posed a particular problem in the  
34 community of Cantwell which is right on the boundaries of  
35 Denali Park in which the Cantwell Village Corporation had  
36 selected a fairly large number of acres adjacent to their  
37 community with inside of the Park. Those lands that they  
38 selected for subsistence uses as well as other developmental  
39 purposes are currently not open to the village residents for  
40 subsistence hunting, trapping, and fishing.

41  
42 The commission's position was that they believe that  
43 with inside of the boundaries of Denali or with inside of the  
44 boundaries of a Federal conservation unit, that selected lands  
45 should be available for Title 8 subsistence. They felt  
46 uncomfortable with extending Federal jurisdiction beyond the  
47 boundaries of Denali or beyond the boundaries of a conservation  
48 unit. So they did not support that aspect of the petition;  
49 although, there were several members at the commission who made  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

statements that lands to the east of Cantwell which are within the Bureau of Land Management jurisdiction, the previous year had been selected by the State of Alaska, and those lands also were removed from the Federal subsistence program. And that was of major concern to several of the commission members and they, in turn, supported the concept that not only beyond Denali but in these other Federal jurisdiction areas that selected land should be available to the Federal program. They were strongly opposed into the Federal jurisdiction being exerted beyond the boundaries of any conservation unit.

11

12 So, the point that I wanted to bring up here is that within the boundaries of any National Park in Alaska where you have a village-selected lands, State-selected lands, or Native allotments that have not yet been conveyed, that the Federal program doesn't apply on those lands and since there's no authorized State, sport or general hunts, that that authority does not apply either. So these lands that are in limbo that have been selected and have not yet been conveyed are basically closed to all subsistence uses and that is a fairly significant concern for subsistence users associated with National Parks.

22

23 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman? Hollis, I was wondering if the State Board of Game cannot provide a hunt for those -- those conveyed lands are under State authority now, aren't they?

27

28 MR. TWITCHELL: Inside of the National Preserve, Park Service Preserves where you have authorization for State hunts as well as the Federal program,....

31

32 MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum.

33

34 MR. TWITCHELL: ....on those selected lands within preserves, there is an opportunity to utilize State general hunts and sport hunts and trapping seasons which would be similar to BLM lands and Fish and Wildlife Service lands.

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: I have a misunderstanding about this. It's my understanding that conveyed lands and State lands are under State management, whether they're inside or outside of parks and the Park Service can control the eligibility of the people to access those lands, but the State may set seasons and bag limits. Was there a court decision about -- who interpreted that aspect?

46

47 MR. TWITCHELL: Once lands have been conveyed to a Native corporation, those lands become private lands and, as such, Federal jurisdiction does not apply on them in the ANILCA

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

areas. So those lands that have been selected and have gone through conveyance, they then fall out of the Federal jurisdiction.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

6

7 MR. TWITCHELL: And State hunting, trapping regulations apply on them, even though those lands may be within the boundaries of a National Park because they become private lands. The issue here is the selected lands that currently are not open....

12

13 MR. REAKOFF: Oh, they're just in total limbo then? They're in a total limbo then?

15

16 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. And that's the problem.

18

19 MR. REAKOFF: Well, then we're -- I'm very much in favor of this NARC proposal because these limbo lands, people are in hardship; they can hunt down in those then.

22

23 MR. TWITCHELL: It seems ironic that Native lands that were selected for subsistence purposes, primarily or in part, would be excluded from subsistence uses in which very often the villages may have selected those lands for those purposes. It seems rather ironic to me that that's the situation. And I understand what ANILCA says and I know what the definitions of public lands are in ANILCA. I don't believe that it was Congress' intent to exclude those lands because I don't believe fourteen, fifteen years ago that they really anticipated Federal assumption or that people would be very closely defining where Federal jurisdiction could or could not apply. So, I think we have a changing situation here in Alaska from what was the situation when ANILCA was passed.

36

37 MR. MORGAN: I had a question. So, if this passes, what will help that situation?

39

40 MR. TWITCHELL: Excuse me?

41

42 MR. MORGAN: If this passes, that will help that situation or what? This NARC.

44

45 MR. TWITCHELL: Yes, it will inside of National Park lands. If Federal jurisdiction for subsistence is authorized on selected lands with inside of a National Park, that would entitle the Federal program for subsistence hunting, trapping, and fishing to occur on those lands. So, it would be

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

beneficial, certainly, to Denali subsistence users who have selected lands near their villages. I reiterate again that the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission was not in favor of extending that Federal jurisdiction beyond the boundaries of a conservation unit. They were strongly opposed to that.

6

7 MR. REAKOFF: Well, that's because they're a resource  
8 commission dealing with Gates -- or dealing with the Park and  
9 -- sitting on those commissions, we can't really reach  
10 outside of our boundaries. But we're in the Western Interior  
11 Regional Council and we can -- we deal with all mosaics of all  
12 different kinds of lands. Right now if that's the case where  
13 knowing that the conveyance process is a very slow process and  
14 it could be years and years and years, people could be  
15 suffering hardship. There could -- basically, closed areas,  
16 large closed tracts of land. I'm not in favor of that. I  
17 think something's got to be remedied in the most expeditious  
18 way. Mr. Chairman?

19

20 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes, Jack?

21

22 MR. REAKOFF: I'd like to know what the State's  
23 position is. You've got -- Tim, what's the State's position on  
24 this whole deal, since you're the State representative?

25

26 MR. OSBORNE: We don't have a -- I wouldn't be willing  
27 to speak for the State's position.

28

29 MR. REAKOFF: Oh, they haven't given you a little  
30 statement to read or anything?

31

32 MR. OSBORNE: No.

33

34 MR. REAKOFF: No? Okay.

35

36 MR. OSBORNE: That's just beyond my level and they  
37 haven't....

38

39 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes, Jeff?

40

41 MR. DENTON: Mr. Chairman, if I might, there have been  
42 some other complications involved with this. One is  
43 incorporation and village over-selections which actually has  
44 thrown a great deal more lands into this limbo situation and,  
45 finally, by the law is legal. However, those over-selections  
46 have been let stand basically by administrative decision, so  
47 those folks will have a lot more lands to prioritize than when  
48 it comes to conveyance. And if a lot of the selections were  
49 brought in to the legal sideboards of what over-selections are

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

allowed, there'd be a significant amount of lands that would fall back into Federal Public lands. So there's -- that's a complicating issue dealing with conveyances that isn't brought into the picture. But there's a great deal - we're talking millions of acres - of over-selections by corporations, by the State, by village corporations that are not really legal but they're let stand. And they've thrown a lot of lands into this limbo status that really probably shouldn't even be there. And that's a battle that's been fought in a totally different realm because of the lands that people have coming and the policies towards giving the very liberal approach to corporation and village selections.

13

14 So, there are ways to bring lands back into Federal Public lands by legalizing the over-selections and dropping the over-selections out. And that means sitting down with the corporations and the villages and prioritizing the lands that they really want to have selected.

19

20 MR. HUNTINGTON: Hollis?

21

22 MR. TWITCHELL: The Park Service at Denali had some discussions with the corporation, the Ahtna Native Corporation with the selections with inside of the boundaries and inquiring what their intentions would be for these lands, recognizing that there may be over-selections involved. And what we were told was that in the situation at Denali that Ahtna is down to within 20% of their land entitlement remaining; 20% of the lands that they're entitled to select, they have not yet received conveyance to and that they are being very cautious on how they fulfill their last 20%. And they're in not a particular hurry to make those selections until they fully assess the resource potential that their lands have. Subsequently, they had no time-line in which they would move forward to deal with these selections, particularly within Denali. So, we did not get a sense from Ahtna that they would be moving quickly to try to alleviate this problem so that they recognize that even their own villagers are experiencing a hardship just from the situation. But they felt the overlying need to truly assess their resources before they make their selections. So, we have no idea when the lands will either be conveyed to the Native corporation or whether and when they'll be relinquished. If they relinquish those lands, it then reverts back to the definition of Federal Public lands and those lands would again be open to the Title 8 subsistence.

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: Jack?

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. REAKOFF: I would like to ask the BLM  
3 representatives what's the maximum time-frame that the State  
4 conveyances could take. That could be several more years,  
5 couldn't it?

6  
7 MR. DENTON: The State, as of a year ago, had to  
8 finalize their selections. The actual conveyance process is  
9 going to take awhile; however, currently, the State is  
10 relinquishing some of their over-selections back to Federal  
11 Public lands. The Anchorage district in the last two months  
12 has relinquished about a million and a half acres back. That  
13 process is now happening with the State of Alaska. It's not  
14 happening with the Native lands conveyances because they  
15 don't -- they never had a sunset for all this stuff to take --  
16 be done. I can't give you a time-frame for the -- when all the  
17 conveyances and the State stuff is going to settle out. I can  
18 tell you that there's an active process now; the State is  
19 actually making hard decisions on what lands come back, what  
20 lands they are prioritizing that they will keep. They  
21 prioritized all their selections in the seven categories in  
22 Alaska. There's maps available of that. The category seven  
23 lands of their priorities are the ones that are being  
24 relinquished this year and those are the lands that, at least  
25 Anchorage, that they've seen come back so far. We expect  
26 that to be a fairly active program of relinquishments for a  
27 couple, three, four years, anyway. Did that answer your  
28 question or not? I can't give you....

29  
30 MR. REAKOFF: I'm....

31  
32 MR. DENTON: ....the time-frame for total conveyance,  
33 but there's a lot of lands coming back into Federal Public  
34 lands from the State selection standpoint.

35  
36 MR. REAKOFF: If the State relinquished all their over-  
37 selection, would they then be conveyed all their lands  
38 immediately?

39  
40 MR. DENTON: No. Those lands would still stay selected  
41 until surveys have to be done, there's a lot of -- the process  
42 conveyance, you know, there's a lot of legal things like  
43 surveys. They've got to have it identified, plats, and there's  
44 a lot of work involved with transferring Federal lands into  
45 private ownership and that's, you know, between the cadastral  
46 survey folks and lots of paperwork and title and all this sort  
47 thing. So, you're talking millions of acres of land and it  
48 takes....

49  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. REAKOFF: Years.

2

3 MR. DENTON: ....time to do that. Our conveyance  
4 staffs are being cut in the BLM in terms of people. So, that's  
5 going to slow the process probably further. But it is a lot  
6 more active in terms of land coming back into Federal Public  
7 lands than it has been for several years.

8

9 MR. DEACON: Mr. Chairman, before we go on with more  
10 with this in the meeting, we have to have public comments and  
11 make decisions based on comments before -- I know I have to.  
12 But D.C. wants comments from the public; that's the way I  
13 understand it. I want to know more about my area. That's what  
14 I'm -- National Park, that's different from our ball game (ph).  
15 I'd like to -- we can be talking about this all day here and  
16 we still don't understand the full length of it. So, I'd like  
17 this -- Mr. Chairman, I'd like to see this after comments come  
18 from the various agencies, I guess. And I'd like to know  
19 more about -- there is nobody in our village area that  
20 understands this kind of system to give us our Federal thinking  
21 and public thinking. You know, public thinking is -- it's --  
22 from my area, that's, you know, everything is the way it's  
23 supposed to be. Federal is thinking of regulating all that  
24 stuff within years to come. So, I'd just kind of -- we need  
25 some help, you know, outside help, local help people to make a  
26 comment, to make a statement from my area.

27

28 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we -- you know, I can -- we  
29 have copies here. I can provide copies to, you know,  
30 communities in your area if you so desire. You know, that --  
31 just let me know that because the comment period, if I remember  
32 correctly, is up till April 3rd, so there's some time to get  
33 that out. Obviously, the council has several options here.  
34 They can make no comment; they can make a comment for or  
35 against; or take a combination thereof. So, I understand  
36 Mr. Deacon is saying he would like to know more about his  
37 specific area, but you may want to at this meeting remember  
38 that, but focus on the whole region for Western Interior and  
39 how this would affect. But if you'd like, we can send copies  
40 if you want to give myself, you know, a list of the communities  
41 and individuals that may not have received this Federal Register  
42 notice and the petition. We can do that and I'd encourage them  
43 to look it over and decide how they want to deal with it.

44

45 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering what the  
46 time-frame on the comment for this NARC Petition is....

47

48 MR. COLLINS: April 3, '95.

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. REAKOFF: ....so it'll be done before our next  
 meeting. So, if we're going to make a comment about it, we  
 have to do it at this meeting.

4  
 5 MR. HUNTINGTON: Mike, you have a question?

6  
 7 MR. COFFING: Just a comment, Mr. Chairman. I think  
 it'd be helpful. I think Mr. Deacon had an important question  
 that's real basic, and that is how this is going to affect  
 people in my region, people in and around my community if it's  
 adopted or not adopted. And I think that, you know, the real  
 answer to that is, well, what lands have been selected near  
 your community but not conveyed yet. So, I think that there's  
 a real, you know, potential that some communities might be  
 impacted a lot; some may not be impacted much at all. Hunting  
 areas that people travel to could be impacted or not impacted  
 by regulations if this is adopted depending on whether those  
 lands are already conveyed or they're simply in a selected  
 status.

20  
 21 Using some numbers that are in this NARC Petition, at  
 least 60 million acres throughout the State have been selected  
 but not conveyed. So, we know that at least 60 million acres  
 are in this status. An additional 29 million acres have yet to  
 be selected, so we know that, you know, if that 29 million  
 acres was selected but not conveyed, there could be  
 approximately 89 million acres of land that you're talking  
 about here and, you know, some of that land may not be near a  
 community; some is near Lime Village. But in the Nana region,  
 there's almost two million acres of land up there, 1.7 million  
 acres of land in the Nana region that are -- that have been  
 selected and that because they've been selected are under State  
 regulations and not Federal subsistence regulations. And I  
 think that's part of what was driving the recent council up  
 here to try to get some action on getting some Federal  
 protection on those lands that have been selected in the Nana  
 region. And I'm going to stop there, but I just wanted to  
 emphasize that, you know, for some of you, it may not affect  
 you; for some of you, it might. But it certainly will have a  
 different impact in different parts of the State depending on  
 what their selections are. And I think that unless we can, you  
 know, unless we had a map or something to look where those  
 selections are, it's real hard to know what the impact might  
 be.

45  
 46 MR. HUNTINGTON: Phil?

47  
 48 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah, I just want to know the proc- -- I  
 mean, this is not a proposal like in the red book here. This  
 50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515



1 is a petition from the Western Arctic Regional Council? What  
2 happens if we pass it here? Where does it go from here?

3  
4 MR. MATHEWS: That's a good question. My understanding  
5 it'll go to obviously Mr. Pospahala of Fish and Wildlife  
6 Service and they'll be compiled and provided to the Federal  
7 Subsistence Board, for one, and I would assume it would go to  
8 both the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, and so they  
9 would have an indication that the users -- or I shouldn't say  
10 the users, the residents of Alaska, their comments are for or  
11 against or whatever. I'm not sure where it goes after that as  
12 far as would the board take it up. It just says it's going to  
13 add the secretaries in reaching a decision on this petition.  
14 The Federal Subsistence Board is soliciting public comments.  
15 So, the board feels like it needs to answer this petition.

16  
17 I don't know, I doubt if it would be on the April board  
18 meeting agenda, but I haven't seen that agenda. The board  
19 meets on the 10th through the 14th. I really doubt if all  
20 these comments would be somewhat dealt with before April 10th,  
21 so I would assume this would be a later meeting that the board  
22 would take up.

23  
24 MR. GRAHAM: So, it seems like if it was passed, it  
25 would be, you know, another year before it was implemented.

26  
27 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, I think that's a fair assumption and  
28 would assume the governor and the State's attorney would go  
29 to court immediately if this passed. So, I would assume  
30 there'd be litigation that would possibly prevent it from going  
31 any further. So, that would add on another year or two there.  
32 But the question is -- the basic questions are, Should Federal  
33 authority go beyond Federal lands and should it be to Native  
34 and selected lands? If we think about court actions, we'll  
35 never move anywhere on any issue.

36  
37 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman?

38  
39 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes, Herman?

40  
41 MR. MORGAN: I'd like to know, have other councils been  
42 discussing this, particularly in your rural areas? And what's  
43 their opinions on it if they have been discussing it?

44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, it's -- to my knowledge,  
46 it's on all or most of all of the agendas of the ten councils.  
47 We've not received reports back from any of them. We've been  
48 kind of scattered to the winds because I think right now we're  
49 meeting -- two other councils are meeting at the same time. I

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Haven't gotten an indication. I think it'll end up being similar -- it'll be across the spectrum. I think it'd be, no doubt, across the spectrum: those that would be very supportive of it and those that would like combinations of it, and maybe even some against it.

6

7 MS. MASCHMEYER: Mr. Chairman, I was present at Southeast Council's meeting and initially they wanted to adopt the petition, but upon further investigation they felt like they needed to study it more before they, you know, signed it as a signee or co-signee. But as I recall, you know, there was much support over it, but the council just wanted, you know, more time to make sure that they knew exactly what they were endorsing.

15

16 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, one more comment. You know, 17 kind of support it, but one of the regrets I have is that we'll probably run into the same problem like we're having with this wolf problem, you know. It's controlled by them groups down in the States, you know, and they don't know how bad it is up here, you know. And if there's -- up in the State, you know, they were controlling them pretty good, but now they can't because a lot of them groups down in the Lower 48, they say no. And I'm afraid that we might run into more things like that, you know. I know that they're trying to help subsistence users, but that's the only problem I see with Federal management is a lot of times it's controlled by them people down in the States and they have a lot of money, them environmental groups and stuff. That's the only problem I see with Federal take-over.

31

32 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is there any more comment on the NARC Petition? I'm in support of this petition and I would like to see this board here support it in the form of motion. Is there any -- there's a -- is there a motion on the floor to support or oppose it?

37

38 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I make the motion to support.

40

41 MR. HUNTINGTON: I have a motion on the floor to support the petition. Is there a second?

43

44 MR. GRAHAM: I second it.

45

46 MR. HUNTINGTON: Second. Second to support the petition. Any questions? Call for a vote. All in favor of the petition, signify by saying aye.

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. REAKOFF: Aye.  
2  
3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Aye.  
4  
5 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Aye.  
6  
7 MR. GRAHAM: Aye.  
8  
9 MR. DEACON: Aye.  
10  
11 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign?  
12  
13 MR. COLLINS: Aye.  
14  
15 MR. MORGAN: Aye.  
16  
17 MR. HUNTINGTON: Two opposed. Two opposed and six in  
18 favor of -- the motion passed.  
19  
20 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, as we did at your last  
21 meeting, we recorded your vote and that I think it'd be wise to  
22 get an idea of your justification for support and then the  
23 minority opinions, so it's clear to all as to -- if they want  
24 to give their opinion so we have it recorded. So, if we could  
25 start off with the majority of why you supported it in one or  
26 two sentences and then with the minority.  
27  
28 MR. HUNTINGTON: I don't think you have to have a vote  
29 for approval, but I think you have to have one for opposing.  
30  
31 MR. MATHEWS: We do need both. We definitely have  
32 -- it's best to get a minority, but we want to make sure.  
33 We can capture it from the transcript, but sometimes someone  
34 can summarize it and it just makes it easier to plug in the  
35 system why they support it, the majority. And then it's best  
36 always to reflect the minority when you have a split vote.  
37  
38 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. We'll go down the line,  
39 starting with Phil. Do you have a reason to support? A  
40 short....  
41  
42 MR. GRAHAM: I voted yes, understanding that really  
43 we're just taking a stand on this, not that I can see anything  
44 happening in the near future and not understanding what might  
45 happen. But it's my feeling that the Federal subsistence  
46 program is better than the State and these lands -- there are  
47 people that need to use these lands and they can't legally do  
48 at the present time. So, I think they should be -- you  
49 know, I think they should be able to use these lands, people  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

that are near the land.

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Phil. Pollock?

4

5 MR. SIMON: I would like to see the way of life as  
6 subsistence protected.

7

8 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Jack?

9

10 MR. REAKOFF: My feeling is with the long conveyance  
11 process that there's going to be people who need the  
12 subsistence resources on these non-conveyed lands that will be  
13 in a hardship case. I also feel that the Federal subsistence  
14 program addresses the needs of the local rural residents'  
15 subsistence over the State's, otherwise, I wouldn't be on this  
16 council.

17

18 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Herman?

19

20 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. I voted to oppose it, although I  
21 support their concept of, you know, helping rural subsistence  
22 needs that the State Advisory Committee -- I'm on it, I'm on  
23 that, too, and we do that, too, you know. I see problems with  
24 having the Federal government take over because like three  
25 examples right now, there's this wolf control thing, you know,  
26 where before the State had a pretty good wolf control program,  
27 you know, and if they put it to a Federal, we'd never have  
28 that. We'll never have that. And like right now, they're  
29 killing a lot of moose around Aniak, you know, and there's  
30 people down in the States, they feel the moose have more rights  
31 than the people who are subsistence users. And another thing  
32 trapping, you know. A lot of them Federal people -- or  
33 Bower 48, they're against trapping and a lot of people depend  
34 on that, you know. And another thing is, you know, I don't  
35 know if you read the paper, but they're voting to ban any new  
36 regulations, you know. And you know, with them being so far  
37 away and everything, you know, we're already seeing problems  
38 with it and we'll probably see more problems with it. These  
39 are just three examples already. And I feel that the State,  
40 you know, although right now there's two different lands -- I'm  
41 on both committees, you know. You ask me if I feel -- the  
42 State can -- you know, they're not perfect, but they're local.  
43 They're more local than Federal. That's the way I see it.

44

45 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Henry?

46

47 MR. DEACON: I kind of oppose it because I really don't  
48 understand. Like I say, I represent people in our area and I'd  
49 like to hear their opinion and I'd like to lead their -- if

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

they say they want that, then that's where it should go. I'd like to hear from people before I make a big decision on something like that. That's why I want more information. That's only -- even though I'm for it, I question it yet, till I hear from other people.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Gloria?

MS. MASCHMEYER: Yes. Mr. Chair, I was just trying to get clarification on Mr. Morgan's reason for objection. Would it -- is it correct in understanding that you feel that it should stay under State as it is? Your objection is because State is local control and Washington is Federal control and there's already a lot of Federal control?

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, and there's problems with it, like I mentioned before like wolf control. That's the best -- the prime example right there. You know, the State had a pretty good wolf control program, you know. That's a prime example right there.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I would support it within the conservation units like within the Park because I think it clarifies that, but I can't support it for all of the lands, Federal lands outside those units. That was my reason for voting against it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. My reason for supporting it is because I think it's necessary and I think it's justified. Sharon?

MS. GURTLE-STRICK: And my reason was, as Henry just stated, I think that people need access to the local game for subsistence uses.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we need kind of a clarification here. You announced that the vote was six in favor and two opposed. But now it appears to be that it's three opposed and five in favor. Is that correct?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I heard two nays only, unless you heard another one.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I need a clarification on Mr. Deacon's vote, then.

MR. DEACON: I voted no.

MR. MATHEWS: You voted for it or against it?

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. DEACON: Against.  
3  
4 MR. MATHEWS: Against. Okay. That's all we need to  
5 know.  
6  
7 MR. COLLINS: I think there was three unless you're....  
8  
9 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.  
10  
11 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. The vote goes three to five in  
12 favor.  
13  
14 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. And I just need clarification.  
15 Henry, you're going to let me know where this should be  
16 distributed to sometime before the close of the meeting. You  
17 wanted it distributed in your area. Do you still want that?  
18  
19 MR. DEACON: If we can find attorney.  
20  
21 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. During break or that, just let me  
22 know what communities and we'll go ahead with that.  
23  
24 MR. HUNTINGTON: I would like to see some kind of  
25 action on this from this board to the Federal board.  
26  
27 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. If I understand, you'd like some  
28 action on this before the Federal board -- the action will be  
29 recorded in your minutes and you'll get a copy of the  
30 justifications. But if the council so desires, you can have me  
31 write a letter to the board summarizing the majority and  
32 minority opinion on this. Just -- I mean, I can do that, also,  
33 but it's recorded in your minutes. And, put it this way, I  
34 think it's clear to me that a separate letter needs to be  
35 addressed on this to the board. Is that -- is everyone in  
36 agreement on that?  
37  
38 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.  
39  
40 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Thank you.  
41  
42 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is there any more questions on this  
43 MARC Petition. Maybe we have some people from the public here  
44 that might want to comment on it. Any comments from the  
45 public? Also, I'd like to state that we'd like to have an open  
46 meeting. Anybody that wants to comment on any concerns, just  
47 be free to -- feel free to come on up to the mike and speak.  
48 We're going on to our next item on the agenda. This Unit 21(E)  
49 Garibou report. Jeff Denton and Conrad Guenther.  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, we really don't have much to  
3 report this year since the Western Arctic Caribou Herd did not  
4 move down into 20(E). Other than the few caribou that had  
5 shown up across the Yukon from Holy Cross prior to the fall  
6 meeting that we had. I think there were twenty-three caribou,  
7 I believe. Is that correct, that the people have located  
8 there? Tim can fill in on anything I miss on this. Basically,  
9 we haven't had much caribou action at all other than some of  
10 the local resident caribou that seemed to be in the area. Tim?

11  
12 MR. OSBORNE: Yes, I'm speaking for Jack here. In  
13 21(E) we get part of the Western Arctic Caribou that every year  
14 goes down and it's mainly in the Upper Anvik River Drainage  
15 than last year. They went all the way down almost to  
16 St. Mary's, and so there was a large number, about 100,000  
17 caribou from the Western Arctic Caribou, actually in 21(E)  
18 probably. But that was the first time in years and years that  
19 caribou have been down there. This year just very few of them  
20 have gone past the Unalakleet-Kaltag Portage.

21  
22 (Adjusting microphones)  
23

24 MR. OSBORNE: Is that the mating call of the caribou in  
25 21(E)? There is probably a chance also that if the  
26 Melchatna Herd crosses the Kuskokwim and comes on up the north  
27 side that there will be some caribou going into the south --  
28 southern portion of 21(E), but actually there are no resident  
29 caribou within 21(E).

30  
31 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is that it?  
32

33 MR. OSBORNE: That's it.  
34

35 MR. MORGAN: I had a question. With the caribou coming  
36 in, do you see a lot of wolves coming in too along with the  
37 caribou?

38  
39 MR. OSBORNE: I would imagine there's a lot of wolves  
40 in 21(E) already because of the high moose population that's  
41 around the Holy Cross area and, of course, in a lot of hills,  
42 there's a lot of wolves that are up in there when the caribou  
43 come down.

44  
45 MR. MORGAN: Do wolves generally -- do they generally  
46 hang around caribou herds, though, or do they kind of follow  
47 the caribou herds?

48  
49 MR. OSBORNE: I don't believe we have any studies that  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

show wolves migrating with caribou in the Interior, but we do have them up on the North Slope where wolves will -- and up in the Brooks Range area where wolves -- and along in Unit 23 in Northwest Arctic where we've had radio-collared wolves that have followed caribou packs.

6

7 MR. MORGAN: Do you count wolves or do you have a  
8 general idea of the number of wolves from doing the caribou  
9 study at the same time?

10

11 MR. OSBORNE: In Unit 21(E)?

12

13 MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

14

15 MR. OSBORNE: No, we do not. We do not have a good  
16 idea of how many wolves are there.

17

18 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Conrad?

19

20 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, and, Herman, just one comment  
21 on caribou following wolves (sic). As Tim said, there really  
22 not any really good studies that would verify that caribou  
23 follow wolves -- or wolves do follow caribou. One of the  
24 things that may be happening north of the Brooks Range and in  
25 some areas in Canada, basically, the only prey-base animal for  
26 the wolves in those areas, large prey-base animal, are caribou.  
27 And so what happens is you have wolves with extremely large  
28 pack ranges; pack ranges so big that actually they may follow a  
29 caribou herd for a week and stay within their pack range. But  
30 there's quite a bit of good evidence that pack ranges are  
31 fairly well-defined and that packs do not normally go into  
32 other pack ranges because there's too much aggression between  
33 packs. That's about the best we have, without some really  
34 extensive dollars put into it. We think that probably in most  
35 cases, wolves, really, are somewhat limited to their pack range  
36 and even though they may appear to be following caribou,  
37 they're actually just staying within a large pack range.

38

39 In areas where there's other prey animals such as  
40 moose, wolves tend to have somewhat smaller pack ranges because  
41 there's more food available to them and so they don't seem to  
42 follow the caribou like they do in areas where their ranges are  
43 really large. So, maybe if that helps you understand, you  
44 know, what we know about wolves and that right now. There is  
45 the study that would seem to imply that there may be some lone  
46 wolves, in other words, probably young males that have been --  
47 have left packs, that actually may move with the caribou herds  
48 and actually cross other pack ranges. But, again, until  
49 somebody can get out and put some collars on some of those

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



Wolves and follow them, we can't really verify that's the case.

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, Ray.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: Question. When caribou start increasing  
6 in an area, though, you're likely to have the pack size  
7 increase, wouldn't you? So, that would result in more wolves  
8 or larger packs than if they were just feeding on local....

9

10 MR. GUENTHER: You know, the problem that we run into  
11 with caribou, though, is because caribou move in and out of  
12 areas. This creates problems for wolf packs building up to  
13 large numbers because when the caribou aren't there, they have  
14 to have some other prey base. And so that's somewhat of a  
15 limiting factor on, you know, the question you're asking.

16

17 MR. COLLINS: All right.

18

19 MR. GUENTHER: Again, there's a lot of information  
20 about wolves that we just do not have good knowledge on right  
21 now.

22

23 MR. HUNTINGTON: Phil?

24

25 MR. GRAHAM: Just a question. How much do pack ranges  
26 overlap, or is there much overlapping?

27

28 MR. GUENTHER: From the studies that have been done  
29 here in Alaska and also in Canada and some studies down in the  
30 area around Minnesota, there's -- as far as pack range overlap,  
31 it's probably almost zero. There's -- you know, this is a  
32 really tough one because you have to have wolves collared in  
33 all the local packs to see if they're overlapping. Now, what  
34 they've found is that there may be some seasonal changes in  
35 pack range, and so you get what appears to be overlaps, but  
36 actually the ranges change. Now, all the studies don't show  
37 this, but there have been a couple of studies where there  
38 appears to be some seasonal changes in where the range is, so  
39 the boundary will change.

40

41 You'll also have a situation where a pack may move in  
42 and start re-establishing a new area, so they actually change  
43 the range of an adjacent pack. There's just a lot of things  
44 going on we really don't understand. There may be localized  
45 things that are occurring where there's some local variations  
46 in the way packs behave. We know in a few cases we've had  
47 conglomerate packs where we've had very specific packs with  
48 pack ranges. Say we've got packs of four to six wolves, and  
49 all of a sudden for some reason we get a large number of wolves

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

that show up in an area usually where there's a big caribou concentration. We think probably there are packs from around that area that somehow, because there's such a huge food base, start getting some overlap in pack ranges. One of the people that have observed that in a scientific study felt there -- they had a number of wolves tagged and they felt that there actually was family relationships between some of these packs, and they theorize, and we don't know this, that it may be that there's -- because of that family relationship that allow these packs to overlap and actually be working in the same area. But they still retain usually some individuality even if that happens.

13

14 There just are a lot of things we really don't understand and there's an awful lot of speculation about what happens with wolves. I guess the critical thing is that, you know, we all realize wolves are highly social animals. Packs play an extremely large role and that there tends to be a lot of aggression between packs -- between neighboring packs. So much aggression that in one study done in Minnesota where deer are the prey base for wolves primarily, that they found that the range where pack ranges came together, that they actually had sections where there were more deer because the wolf packs avoided those range boundaries so much that they hunted the deer away from them and you actually had a build-up of deer in those areas. So, you know, lots and lots of questions and a lot fewer answers.

28

29 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman? The reason I asked that it seemed like seven years ago there was no caribou around Aniak. You know, we never saw caribou, and it seemed like now that there are a lot of caribou, seems like that there are a lot more wolves running around you know, and like up in Aniak River, somebody was saying those wolves, they'd kill moose and eat part of it and then go kill another one, you know, and I was talking to somebody this morning who said the pack of wolves -- they kill wolves every five to ten days, you know, and right now the moose are having a tough time. They're easy prey. They're weak and, you know, that's the reason that -- you know, we noticed there's a lot more wolves around, a lot more caribou.

42

43 MR. GUENTHER: The only thing that I could speculate that might answer that, and maybe Tim or somebody else might have some other comments regarding this, when you start seeing concentrations of caribou, what you may be seeing is that the local wolves are focusing down onto that prey base, and so they become more visible. Where, say, a wolf pack that has a range of fifty square miles, and particularly if it's not really open

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

country, if they're out hunting moose that are fairly scattered, you may -- they may not be as visible to a person, where when you start finding caribou concentrated, particularly in open areas, that that wolf pack becomes more visible because they're hanging right around where those caribou are working them. I don't know. That's speculation on my part. I don't know if that's the case or not.

8

9 MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

10

11 MR. GUENTHER: That's the best I can do to answer that question.

12

13  
14 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. I'd like to comment on that. You know, those caribou, they're about, I don't know, fifteen or twenty miles away, you know, and I've heard there are wolves that come right into town. You know, you can see wolves right in town. There's packs right down the slough, you know, and they never used to be that many.

19

20  
21 MR. GUENTHER: The only comment I might be able to make relative to that is in a -- there's been a few cases where all of a sudden wolves start showing up around towns, even in Fairbanks. Generally, it's a situation where snow conditions make it more difficult for wolves to travel and they start showing up around areas where there's something that might attract them there, like local dogs.

26

27 MR. MORGAN: Or moose.

29

30  
31 MR. GUENTHER: Yeah. I really can't give you any more information than that. I just don't know.

32

33  
34 MR. OSBORNE: I could add a little bit if you wanted.  
35 I mean, wolves will inhabit everything, and just because people build houses in the middle of their territories doesn't make any difference. The best place to see wolves in Ketchikan is the dump. There's a pack of fifteen that lives centered around the dump in Ketchikan. Ruby, a few years ago, had a pack of seven that was living in town eating puppies, garbage, and sleeping under people's houses. This year -- in Galena the last several years we've had wolves right in town running through town and seen all over. I mean, it -- you know, basically if there's a place where no wolf pack living there, they're going to take over. I mean, wolves -- unless you get big towns like Anchorage or whatever, wolves are going to, you know, occupy it, especially if there's food around. They'll be all over.

48

49  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1           One thing I might add, by the way, on wolves following  
2 caribou herds is there's a lot of dispersion of wolves and we  
3 know that when we hang collars on wolves, that if you hang them  
4 on anything other than adults, probably that spring and summer  
5 they're going to be gone and they take off, and we've had --  
6 we've never done a satellite study of dispersing wolves, but we  
7 have maybe twenty or thirty now wolves that have been collared  
8 one place and picked up someplace else, and wolves have been  
9 collared on the Kenai Peninsula, trapped in Fairbanks. Two  
10 wolves from the Gates of the Arctic that were trapped in Canada  
11 over to Anvik on the MacKenzie River. I had a wolf from Galena  
12 that was collared in the North Slope in ANWR country and one  
13 from Kotzebue was trapped on top of Ray Mountains. I mean,  
14 they do travel. These young wolves travel a long ways. And  
15 the other thing within the packs, that come springtime, if  
16 there's any sub adult or close to adult male wolves in the  
17 pack, they'll have fights with the male wolves within a pack  
18 themselves, and there's -- you know, you radio collar a lot of  
19 those sub adult males and you'll come back and find carcasses  
20 in the springtime. They'll be dead. So there's a lot of  
21 killing that goes on within wolves.

22

23           I mean, from all the studies we've done, we've probably  
24 hang close to a thousand radio collars or more over the last  
25 ten years on wolves, and in areas that are close to humans, the  
26 number one cause of death of wolves is humans. In the areas  
27 that are farther away from humans, the number one cause of  
28 death of wolves is other wolves. So they chew each other up  
29 regularly.

30

31           I guess we're getting off the subject of caribou in  
32 (E) a little bit.

33

34           MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Tim. Any more questions on  
35 this wolf report, 21(E)? (Pause) Is that it on a -- Conrad?  
36 The report there? Is that it?

37

38           MR. GUENTHER: Yes. That's everything I have.

39

40           MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings us to G, which  
41 is overview of the customary and traditional determination  
42 process, and under Tab 8 is a letter that Mike will be talking  
43 about, Mike Coffing, and there's also a copy of the Federal  
44 register notice. Mine got flipped so you'll kind of have to  
45 move the pages around. I've given you the background of the  
46 existing C&T program, so I think with that I'll turn it over to  
47 Mike, and then I'll come back on when we get to Upper Tanana  
48 and Copper Region.

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. HUNTINGTON: Mike?

2

3 MR. COFFING: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Vince  
 4 touched yesterday on the statewide C&T. George couldn't make  
 5 it here. I want to come back to that, but first I want to  
 6 briefly update you on the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta process and  
 7 kind of let you know where that is at now, and then I'll  
 8 continue discussing the Statewide C&T. Just before Christmas,  
 9 I prepared some letters, and one of them is in your packet here  
 10 under Tab 8. I think all of the council members got them,  
 11 letters from Richard Pospahala, letting you know that we were  
 12 beginning the scoping process for the YK Delta, Unit 18  
 13 specifically.

14

15 The scoping process is no more than simply letting the  
 16 public know that we were beginning the C&T process and to  
 17 invite the public to provide us with information, with their  
 18 concerns, with their ideas, with information they might have on  
 19 customary and traditional uses, so that we can have that in  
 20 hand as we as staff go through the analysis and prepare  
 21 recommendations for those drafts of C&T determinations --  
 22 eligibility determinations.

23

24 There were several proposals that had already been sent  
 25 to Fish & Wildlife Service prior to me beginning this  
 26 scoping process. I began the assisting Fish & Wildlife on this  
 27 August. That's when I began working on this, and what I had  
 28 done, is I had compiled essentially the proposals that had come  
 29 in and summarized those and made mention in this letter that  
 30 went out. I also attached a sheet on the second page that  
 31 identifies what the current customary and traditional  
 32 determinations are on Federal public lands in Unit 18.

33

34 I want to emphasize here that what I am hoping to do  
 35 and what I had planned to do as I set out on this was to review  
 36 and incorporate comments for customary and traditional uses in  
 37 Unit 18 by anybody. I was not looking at customary and  
 38 additional uses in Unit 19 or Unit 21. My parameters were  
 39 Unit 18 specifically for the uses. However, I know there are  
 40 communities outside of 18 - some in 21, some in 19, and some in  
 41 17 - that come into Unit 18 and to use the resources. That is  
 42 why this council received a letter, as well as the Bristol Bay  
 43 Regional Council, the Seward Peninsula Regional Council. Those  
 44 folks received the same letter -- basically the same notice as  
 45 you did to inform them so they could also be part of the  
 46 process and provide information for communities in their  
 47 regions that would use Unit 18 for subsistence.

48

49 I think so far I've gotten only a couple comments in,  
 50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

One from the refuge manager in Dillingham and another one from the Kuskokwim corporation based in Aniak with offices in Anchorage representing the central Kuskokwim area, primarily Unit 19. So, I'm looking forward to getting more input from councils, from the public. I plan to attend some adversary committee meetings in our -- in my region. I'm from Bethel, in my region next week to get input from the advisory committees. We have a YK Delta Regional Council meeting in Mountain Village March 1st and 2nd, and I expect to get some input from council members there, as well. I also hope to get out and travel in some of the communities in Unit 18 to continue to get some input from the public down there.

13

14 So, that's kind of where it's at. The schedule that I was given to work with -- actually when I was brought on in August, I was told that they would like to get this process for Unit 18 completed by -- I think I actually have to have the determinations done and implemented by July of 1996. The Federal Register notice that went out, and you have a copy under Tab 8, indicates 1995, and that's not going to happen. It's not moving along that fast. So I think we're still shooting for the time period generally 1996, July 1st. That may be delayed a bit because of concerns raised by recent councils at the meeting that we had February 13th and 14th in Anchorage with staff committee.

26

27 I think maybe I'll shift emphasis a little bit now and move into some concerns that were raised at that meeting back in Anchorage the 13th and 14th of February dealing with kind of the C&T process statewide, which would affect you folks. It affects what I'm doing in Unit 18.

32

33 Essentially, some of the councils felt that the process that had been laid out and the schedule that you see in the Federal Register notice was somewhat directed from the top down. The agencies decided kind of where they were going to go, which areas they were going to prioritize completing the C&T determinations, and that, you know, they were -- there was maybe not enough consideration given to what the regional councils wanted. Kind of the top-down process identified that -- or indicated that the way this procedure would go would be that the focus would be on, first, the large game species, and that's why in my letter you see that my focus on this is caribou, bear, muskox, and moose. So that's kind of how the process was laid out, and there, I think, are over two hundred proposals that have been submitted over time to the Federal Subsistence Board since the Federal program took over management in 1990, so there has been this backlog of proposals to change or adopt some customary and traditional use

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

determinations for a variety of species, from small game to  
 furbearers to big game.

3

4 And this schedule that we've been operating on has been  
 delayed several times because of concerns wanting to get  
 council input. The managing agencies would do their best with  
 the best information they had to pull together and analyze  
 information and lay it out for the council's comment. That's  
 happened with the Kenai Peninsula. It's happened with  
 Copper River and Upper Tanana, and those, of course, were the  
 first ones to be worked on, and it became, I think, crystal  
 clear that the councils wanted to have more of a role, and they  
 had concerns that had not been appropriating to the analysis,  
 and because staff committee wanted full council participation  
 in developing these C&T determinations, staff committee, I  
 think, did not want to step forward and try to stay on schedule  
 because they had set a schedule. They felt it was more  
 important to get public involvement and to get involvement from  
 the council do it right.

20

21 At the meeting on 13th and 14th February in Anchorage,  
 several council members were there. In fact, I think Vince  
 indicated most of them were there. Some of the council  
 members, including Mr. Sheldon Katchatag from Unalakleet, kind  
 of laid out what he thought would work for a process and what  
 he was hoping could happen, is that rather than Federal staff  
 coming out and talking to council in public and saying, "Here's  
 our schedule, here's what we'd like to do, and this is when  
 we'd like to have it done," to step back and come to the  
 councils and let the councils tell us what, you know, they want  
 to do, to get input from the councils on what they think is  
 important, which species we should be looking at C&T uses,  
 reviewing those determinations, and -- but maybe more  
 significantly to have -- one of Sheldon's suggestions was to  
 have subregional meetings, to get out to the villages and have  
 public meetings, to get really public input and let the public  
 tell us what their C&T uses are, what their subsistence uses  
 are, and record those, and then based on public input and  
 council input, try to then proceed through developing customary  
 and traditional use determinations that fit what the councils  
 see is necessary and fit, you know, the Federal mandate for  
 getting them done.

43

44 Having said that, I want to be real, you know, up front  
 with you and tell you that I think many of us are not sure kind  
 of where we're at. We know that out of the meeting on the 13th  
 and 14th that there was a lot of concern raised both by the  
 council members, the council chairmen and their designees, and  
 the staff committee, that we need to get more input from the

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

council on this. So I think right now people like myself and other anthropologists and certainly other Federal staff that are involving in this are waiting for somewhat of a clarification from the staff committee on the Federal Subsistence boards and perhaps also from the regional councils on how they would like us to proceed.

7

8 What I'm doing now essentially for Unit 18 is continue to get public input and then waiting for direction from my supervisor in Anchorage as to how to proceed in terms of getting an analysis written up, drafting up the eligibility determinations, and then getting them out for regional council review and public review.

14

15 I think that's about the best I can do in telling you kind of where things are at. I don't -- it might appear that we've gone several steps backward and we're not progressing, but I think I should say at least from my personal standpoint, any time we need to back up because we want to do a better job of getting public input and hearing what the council members' concerns are, I think that's progress and I think that we all realize, certainly on the staff committee and Federal staff, that it's folks like yourself, the regional council members and the public, that are really going to give us direction and are going to make this work, and I think that we're proceeding cautiously, but we want to provide full council participation as much as possible here.

28

29 So I might have jumped over some things that are not coming to mind now, but I'll stop now, and if there are any questions, I'll be glad to answer any question.

32

33 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman? On the first page of your GAT determination I see that muskox has no subsistence, and I was wondering how your scoping process has eliminated an animal that has a historic range within the Unit 18 and is -- as you know, muskox are recolonizing the entire west and north parts of Alaska and will become, hopefully in the near future, a viable subsistence resource, and why was prehistoric, archaeological data excluded in the -- of course, subsistence users five hundred years ago utilized muskox and why were they excluded as no subsistence?

43

44 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Reakoff, the reason here -- there are two reasons. The first reason I'll give you is when the Federal program took over subsistence management or I guess that's the best way to say it. Took over subsistence management in 1990 from the State, the Federal program adopted the state customary and traditional use

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



determinations. Kind of state-wide, they were adopted. Some of them have been changed now. The State determination, Unit 18, was no subsistence on muskox. That's what it was, so that's why it's that way under the Federal program now. That's what was adopted from the State, and it hasn't been addressed, hasn't been modified or changed since then. I guess that's the most direct answer to why the Federal determination is that way.

9

10 As to why the State determination was that way prior to that, I believe that, you know, I -- I think I can say pretty confidently that it was the opinion of the State that muskox were not indigenous to Unit 18, that they were not out there historically, that muskox were introduced from Unimak (ph) in the thirties, introduced to the mainland and Nelson Island in 1967, and then of course you have in other areas were introduced from Unimak to North Slope, Seward Peninsula, Arctic Refuge, and other places. That, I think, is why the State did not determine that muskox were a subsistence resource to Unit 18.

21

22 Now, that could change under the Federal program, and I think it comes down to what the council recommends in the area. That also comes down to, I think, what the staff committee and the Federal Subsistence Board recognizes as customary and additional use, and that is -- I think the real question that they're going to have to look at is: Does an animal have to have been indigenous to have customary and traditional use? Or is the fact that it's been in the region for ninety years and people have been using it qualify it as a subsistence use and a traditional use?

32

33 On the North Slope in ANWR, muskox were indigenous to the North Slope, so I think that determination for some of the North Slope communities by the Federal Subsistence Board came easier because there was that historic use and archaeological evidence pointing to that, but that hasn't been the case in Unit 18 that we found.

39

40 MR. REAKOFF: Have you ever found bones coming out of banks or anything?

42

43 MR. HUNTINGTON: I have a question here. How easy would it be to reinstate this muskox into the C&T determination?

46

47 MR. COFFING: I'm sorry?

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: How long -- would there be any problem

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

to get the muskox back into the C&T determination for Unit 18?

2

3 MR. COFFING: Well, it's never been there as a  
4 determination. I think the process would be one of looking at  
5 the historical/biological evidence to see, in fact, if muskox  
6 were there. That would be the job of, you know, the staff  
7 biologists. We'd pull that information together. I would pull  
8 together information on historical, indigenous use of muskox,  
9 why people that live, you know, in the region there -- and we'd  
10 essentially give a literature search and pull together all the  
11 information we could find, and then we would, based on that,  
12 write up a draft analysis of what we saw going on with muskox.  
13 We would then bring that to the regional council -- to the YK  
14 Delta Regional Council. They, of course, then could look at it  
15 and offer comments, and then, of course, it would go to staff  
16 committee and then Federal subsistence board. But I think what  
17's going to take is a full analysis and looking....

18

19 (Mr. Deacon, Mr. Reakoff, and Mr. Morgan talking  
20 amongst themselves.)

21

22 MR. HUNTINGTON: Hold on. Jack, can we have order? Go  
23 on, Mike.

24

25 MR. COFFING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think what it  
26 would take is really a full analysis and look at what the  
27 evidence is and what the information is, pulling that together,  
28 and we haven't done that yet, and I think that's kind of where  
29 we're in the process now, of starting to pull that together,  
30 and, you know, I expect that I'm going to hear from council  
31 members in the region I'm from as well as the public in the  
32 region from, and they're going to be interested to know, you  
33 know, what we're going to do, and we're going to have some  
34 people that are going to be very supportive of getting a C&T  
35 determination for muskox in the region.

36

37 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, also when it gets to the  
38 stage where there's recommendations from councils, this will be  
39 before you, this C&T determination process. So this council at  
40 that time could make a recommendation to maintain the status  
41 quo or ask it to change. Then that would be put to test at the  
42 Federal Subsistence Board if it meets the criteria of  
43 substantial evidence, conservation of the species, and then the  
44 third one is detrimental to subsistence uses. So it would be  
45 tested there. So it will be back before this council, but the  
46 board will obviously look a lot closer to the YK Council for  
47 their recommendation. But your recommendation will also be  
48 before the board when that goes through.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, one thing that I would find  
 2 useful in doing my work from this council is if there are  
 3 council members here that know specifically of communities  
 4 within the western interior area that travel to Unit 18 and use  
 5 Unit 18 -- you know, hunt -- you know, basically practice  
 6 subsistence in Unit 18. Generally along the Kuskokwim I know  
 7 those and some along the Yukon, but if there are council  
 8 members here that could maybe give me some guidance of specific  
 9 communities that they know come into Unit 18 or have any  
 10 suggestions for communities, maybe I should contact further to  
 11 ask them about their uses in Unit 18. I would appreciate that.

12

13

14 All of the communities adjacent to Unit 18 - Stebbins,  
 15 St. Michael, Holy Cross, I think one went Grayling, Anvik,  
 16 Kageluk -- all of them along the Kuskokwim River all the way I  
 17 think to Stony River received the same letter. I've not heard  
 18 from them, but if this council can offer me any guidance for  
 19 communities that I should be especially tuned into or aware of  
 20 in your region that might come into Unit 18, I would appreciate  
 21 that help.

22

23 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Herman, I guess you're  
 24 close to the borderline down there, and I think it probably has  
 25 some effect on your area.

26

27 MR. MORGAN: First of all, I'd like some clarification,  
 28 like if one person used to go down there twenty years ago, does  
 29 that mean that a hundred people can go down there now? How do  
 30 you determine that? If one person used to go down there, can a  
 31 thousand people go down there now?

32

33 MR. COFFING: You mean in -- Mr. Chairman, if I may.  
 34 In this example, and I don't want to take this too far, so tell  
 35 me if I'm getting off track here. But is what you're asking  
 36 me: If one person in Unit 19 would qualify, then does that  
 37 mean more people would qualify to come into 18? Is that what  
 38 you're....

39

40 MR. MORGAN: I mean, when you say customary and --  
 41 customary or -- I don't recall that. You know, if one person  
 42 was to go down there, you know, does that mean that everybody  
 43 in the village can go down there now and hunt?

44

45 MR. COFFING: No. I think, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Morgan,  
 46 the process has been one in making determinations, is to make  
 47 them for communities or areas. So if in looking at the  
 48 information from, you know, whatever community outside the  
 49 region, let's stick one in Unit 19 for example, if it was a

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

general pattern that people in that community or that community had shown uses in Unit 18, then I think if a finding was made, that finding would be made for that community. It wouldn't be for individual people. It would be for the community overall. Well, for example, I know personally that residents of Lower Kalskag and Upper Kalskag and Aniak and perhaps Shraltoff(ph) come into Unit 18 and use that region, as do people from Holy Cross. You know, if they were added -- if their community was determined to have eligibility for Unit 18, that eligibility then would extend to all the people in those communities, not to individuals only in those communities.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: Is there going to be any process for mediating some of this? Because I can see some disputes in the future if resources get short, and what kind of time frame are you looking at? Like when this came before the State, for instance, they were going to include people from Bethel and Bear out on the coast in 19(D) up there on moose because they just said Unit 19 because they happened to cross the border down below, and historically I know that was never the case, you know. The Athabascans would not have allowed people from Bear out on the coast to come up there, take their resources if they were short supply. Is there any kind of time frames on this, or because they've been using it over the last year under the general sport seasons, are they now becoming subsistence users? I think of that in the Yukon area there, you know, where because of commercial fishing, big boats now, people are traveling a long ways for fall moose hunts that they never would have done before they owned those big boats. Has that become subsistence?

31

32 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Collins, you hit on a question that is going to have to be faced, I think, head on, and that is: What constitutes long-term customary and additional use. It has not been determined how long a use has to have occurred before a community qualifies, and I think that any -- you know, there have been some -- I think that the discussions came up on the Kenai with the South Central Council and with staff that have been involved in the analysis. You know, what does constitute customary and traditional use? Long-term use of a resource. Some have suggested, you know, one generation. Some have suggested thirty years. Some have suggested three generations. I mean, there's the whole spectrum that people are offering out. Nothing has been determined. There has not been a time element blocked off as this is the minimum amount of time or the amount of time that's necessary to get you in.

48

49 That is going to raise -- you know, when the

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

determinations are made, there are going to be areas of conflict, and I can -- personally having dealt with it for ten years on the Yukon and the Kuskokwim, it's very much in conflict between upriver users and downriver users, as we locally refer to each other. And Sheldon -- you know, we discussed this at the meeting briefly. Kind of off record, Sheldon and I and Taylor and some others, Taylor Brelsford (ph) -- and I think Sheldon was hoping that in some of these instances where there is this conflict that it may come to joint council meetings where councils -- and if I may pick an example, maybe the Western Interior Council or maybe some members of the Western Interior Council meet with members of or the full YK Delta Council to work out and resolve some of these differences so they can come to some agreement or consensus on who they would recommend or support as being eligible.

16

17 I think any ideas that members here have or your constituents have on what they think should be a time limit, if you want to do something like that, if you have any ideas, any comments that you have, any suggestions, I think would be most welcome in helping the staff and staff committee and the board and of resolve this in their own mind. They are as puzzled about it as you are, I think, and are wanting any help they can get from the public and from the councils.

25

26 MR. HUNTINGTON: Henry, you have a question?

27

28 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I would like to -- I think what would answer Ray and Herman's question is that in the time shortage, which is when there might be a problem with people overlapping, the law defines under Section 804 a criteria for customary and direct dependence upon the populations of the mainstay of livelihood. If there wasn't enough moose, then you refer to 804, to -- that's the process. If there's not enough moose up in Aniak and everybody -- 5,000 people come from Bethel, they go: We don't have enough moose for ourselves, and we're the main, direct dependents upon this population; we want to implement 804 to have a priority. And that's where 804 comes into play.

40

41 You could go into a whole bunch of different scenarios, but the best thing to do is to stay with what ANILCA'S set forth.

44

45 MR. COLLINS: What does 804 say? How would they solve that situation?

47

48 MR. REAKOFF: Well, 804 -- you want me to read the whole thing?

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. COLLINS: Oh, I don't....  
3  
4 MR. GUENTHER: There are three criteria.  
5  
6 MR. REAKOFF: It's just a little short paragraph.  
There's three points. The following criteria shall apply:  
Customary and direct dependence upon the populations as the  
mainstay of livelihood; local residency; and the availability  
of alternate resources. And that answers all the questions.  
The people who are closest to the resource that have depended  
on the resource the longest and have no alternative resource,  
they get the permits to hunt them, and that answers the  
question. So you could go into a whole different scenario, but  
I think that the council should stay with the law. This  
council should stay with the laws as closely as possible.  
17  
18 MR. MATHEWS: We have copies of Title 8 if you want it.  
19  
20  
21 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.  
22  
23 MR. MATHEWS: I figured that this was going to come up,  
but there's two points of the C&T process. One determines who  
can hunt and when and what harvest limits, and then there's the  
priority that Jack talked about. So if the C&T is determined  
not to have certain communities or areas, then they won't have  
the benefit of those seasons. So there's a priority and then  
there's the benefit factor that's involved with it. But it's  
very interesting. I should have done it yesterday, but I  
didn't. I left it to you read, but those issues of what is  
defined as long-term and the discussion you had on one or a  
percent of the community are the same questions that were  
addressed in the letter to Roy Ewan that the board is trying to  
grapple with, and they've been delaying to figure how to deal  
with those, and they're in the same boat you are. What is  
long-term? Is five people from a community enough to consider  
that a customary and traditional use? So it's real interesting  
that it's bouncing back and forth between the council and the  
board.  
41  
42 But if you want copies of Title 8, I brought extra  
copies. Just to Title 8, not of the full ANILCA. But I have a  
copy. I think there's several other staff here that have a  
full copy of ANILCA if other issues come up.  
46  
47 MR. COLLINS: I guess I don't hear that as an answer,  
back, because I think some of the very language in there is  
what's being used to determine now. They're listing resident  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

communities now as local communities. They're not saying the one that's closer than another one. They're already saying these have customary and traditional use and they're listing communities that have that use, and so there would have to be some kind of an arbitration if a conflict comes up in the future because you're saying they're no longer customary and traditional. That's what I -- we're setting precedent, in other words, by defining these right now and putting them in. We're identifying them as having customary and traditional use, so we can't come back later and quickly say, "Well, they're not because they're a little further away."

12

13 MR. REAKOFF: Well, the answer is that maybe we've got caribou that are all over and there's plenty of resource. People travel for hundreds of miles to go to that resource and there's never been any conflict. But the caribou all die off and move away. The people that live closest to the resource -- I mean, that's just the way it's going to be. The Federal Board will decide in every instance who is the closest to the resource and who is going to have the eligibility for the -- it's an unknown number of animals to be taken, and it varies early. So you can never say that the people who live fifty miles away are ineligible 'cause maybe you only have to curtail a small area. Maybe there's only a short period of time or so forth. It's a varying thing, a dynamic question. You'll never be able to answer it. But I'm of the opinion that C&T termination should be the most liberal. If people have used the resource, they should be able to continue to use it until there's a problem, and only in -- the law says for only that population. Maybe they have C&T overlaps between Unit 19 and 38 as far as moose go. Maybe there never is any problem with moose or, say, caribou. But if the moose population goes haywire, that's where the 804 comes into play.

34

35 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, when this gets further along, Mike's working on that, the chairman of the Yukon Kuskokwim was going to be at this meeting, but he had a conflict. I would envision there would be at least one or two joint meetings to kind of air some different issues on that, and also the proposal that was talked about or alternative at this 13th and 14th meeting was to have subregional meetings, and I think I was involved in that discussion with Mike, that then there would be subregional meetings on these borderline communities. But it's going to be a little interesting when there is this upriver/downriver movement. There's going to be a lot of discussion and hopefully through this council system and the respect that each council has for each other maybe a good ground to discuss things like that. But there is direct conflict in areas that have become kind of

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

vicious, is what I've heard.

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Mike?

4

5 MR. COFFING: Yeah. I just wanted to mention that, you know, I think Ray's concern is really -- it's a real good one in his comment. One of the difficulties that -- you know, prior to December of 1989 when the McDowell case was passed and the State lost subsistence management on Federal lands, there certainly were customary and traditional use determinations under the State process. On the Kuskokwim, again using that as an example because that's what I'm familiar with, you know, people all the way down to Johnson River and over to the Tanana villages were provided or were considered eligible for subsistence uses up in Unit 19. Now, as I see it, the way you get into an 804 situation is when you have data that shows that you've got a resource problem. So it's kind of when you have a problem and your resource is dropping off that ensure you're in 804. Then you kind of pick: Well, of all these that are eligible, now we've got a problem; we can only give out so many permits. Who lives the closest? Who has the most continued long-term use? Then you have to review your alternatives. Then you would go to what the State would call a Tier II situation.

25

26 But often there are problems that arise prior to a resource declining that addressed by the pool of people you have in as eligible C&T users, and the larger that pool, in theory the more people you have out in the fall time hunting or whenever, and there are conflicts that come up -- kind of social conflicts that come up that occur well before you might trigger an 804 situation.

33

34 MR. HUNTINGTON: Could we have a ten-minute recess and maybe discuss this further after that recess? Thank you.

36

37 (Off record)

38 (On record)

39

40 MR. HUNTINGTON: I'd like to call the meeting back to order. Can everybody take their seats and we'll get on with the meeting? Under discussion is C&T determination.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, before we go into that, Mike is coming over. I gave each of you on break a receipt. That's for your lodging. Also, Cesa Sam has offered to take the checks that you got and go cash them for you and bring the money back. So if you're agreeable to that, then Cesa will -- she's not back yet. She'll take your check and take the first

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



plane out of here.

2

3 (General laughter)

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: No, she won't do that. But anyway, that  
will free you up to enjoy the full lunch. Otherwise, you'd  
have to go over to the post office and cash that. On the  
receipts, again the rate's been determined is \$40.00 a night,  
so the receipt should reflect two nights at \$40.00 a night.  
That matches Tanana Chiefs' going rate, so I'm going to  
acknowledge that Tanana Chiefs has a representative here and  
we're following your pattern. So thank you, Tanana Chiefs.

13

14 MR. NED: At least we're agreeing on something, anyway.

15

16 MR. MATHEWS: We agree on everything. We agree even to  
disagree, so....(pause)

18

19 MR. NED: Oh, we do? Let's start with customary and  
additional use for the Southeast Province.

21

22 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The last thing before I let it go  
back to C&T, Gloria wrote up -- summarized your action in  
dealing with the NARC Petition. You don't -- you have the  
option of looking it over now and say, "Yes, this is right on,"  
or "No, I think we need to change this or that." We're not  
asking, when we pass this out, for you to revisit that issue or  
reconsider your vote. We're just asking you to make sure we  
captured it so when the letter is written and when it's put  
into the minutes and et cetera, that it truly reflects. Thank  
you.

32

33 MR. DEACON: Mr. Chairman?

34

35 MR. HUNTINGTON: Go ahead.

36

37 MR. DEACON: We're still on the subject that -- what  
we're talking about?

39

40 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, we're still on C&T.

41

42 MR. DEACON: All right. Customary use, you know, we  
talk about this system, people hunting our different areas with  
Bethel Chiefs a couple years ago and express our time back  
hunting days, you know. At that time there's -- really the  
people from those villages said was -- that's not -- people  
never used to go in another people's country and hunt. That's  
the customary system. That was kind of law. Like nowadays, in  
the Twentieth Century, I don't know, you just go and hunt where

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

you feel like, I guess. That's not your real Native trad- -- rural area traditional people's way, and that's -- I don't know how to really put that system that's coming up. For our area, I'd like to see it -- been with us -- Innoko Refuge, does we have anything to say about that area as the surrounding village? I think it should not be anybody can go hunt in there if it's needed. A lot of sport hunters or whatever you call those rich people hunting, that's what it is, people that don't really need it.

10

11 When we had meeting at Holy Cross two or three years ago, a Bethel traditional chief, he came up and would talk about half a day about all of that stuff that's -- how it used to be, and he suggested it was not right to let them go into our country or us going in their country. This was just law. But nowadays and just going into this new system, I don't know how to deal with this for my kids and my grandchildren. We have to set up something, and my way of thinking is different now. Like now, everybody comes up on the coast with big power boats. I said this at McGrath meeting, too, and I can say it again. You know those people go hunting for sport, have ten - fifteen cases of beer and go drink and have a big party, drinking and hunting. And they fought with one guy from Hageluk, 'cause they got him drunk or -- he started saying to this guy, "Well, you're hunting on my country." No, that's their country, too. They got rights. That guy went home all beat up. He was beat up from those hunters from Anchorage. I brought that up, too, last fall in McGrath meeting. I mentioned that.

30

31 So I just wanted to -- I have to take more serious thinking about this kind of stuff and study it, what we talk about. I want to bring it home and make good decision on elders in the local area 'cause they are concerned. They're really dependent on this meeting here, what kind of decision we make. Like that moose hunting that going back. Them old people will say, "It's a good thing we did that; that's the way it should be." So I just wanted to let you know, and we should talk about it more amongst ourselves here instead of the biologists tell us all what's going on. I really feel that we as a village say what we have to say and go back and come back so it can really make progress on this. I'd like to see time-able progress. Thank you.

44

45 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Henry. I'd like to maybe speak on that a little bit. This C&T determination process is going to take years. I think it started on the Kenai and Copper River area, and eventually it's going to, you know, come down our area we're going to have to start making decisions on

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

that. But before that, I'd like to get all the input from, you know, everybody that's involved in it, and I think sometime in the future this board's going to have to sit down and take up a C&T determination on a whole-day process or maybe two-day, you know, to discuss all the pros and cons. But I see this as becoming -- as we get more exposure to the process, you know, I think it more clearer to this board and to the areas that we represent. But now is the time to really start getting some information and find out what it's all about because sooner or later we're going to have to do it.

11

12 MR. COFFING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank Mr. Deacon very much for his comments. I think he made some very strong comments, good comments, about, you know, additional law and customs and how people used to resolve their problems and conflicts and differences about hunting areas, and I want to mention that, you know, in spite of the things this council looks at and in spite of what the Federal Subsistence Board might do, what the State Board of Game, there may remain some problems and issues that are best resolved outside of the state or Federal government by local governments, by local tribal laws, and basically people in communities and regions working things out amongst themselves, like behavior and how do you treat game and how do you share hunting territories and that sort of thing. Some of that is still going to have to, I think, take place at home and in communities, that regulations and laws really can't address some of that. Those all can't be solved by regulations.

29

30 I also wanted to say that right now in Unit -- the western interior area you are not yet in the process of developing or changing the customary and traditional use determinations in this region, and you will be at some time. I don't know when that will be, but in talking to George earlier this week, he indicated it wouldn't be real soon if we stayed with the schedule that was laid out earlier on. Now, if the process changes and if the staff committee and the council and the Federal Subsistence Board would like to begin to look at customary and traditional use determinations on an annual basis, just like a proposal for example where you put in proposals each year to change hunting regulations or guidelines and so forth, there is the possibility that down the road if the councils and the board and staff agree that they want to begin doing customary and traditional use determination that way, then you may be looking at some proposal or some potential changes a little sooner down the road. But as staff, and I'm sure I can speak for George, he'll do his best to keep the council and Vince will also keep you informed about that process and when you might expect to start looking at some C&T

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

action for the western interior.

2

3           The last thing I wanted to mention is that the reasons  
 4 for doing C&T determinations is not solely to determine which  
 5 communities are in and which communities are out, but along the  
 6 process of gathering information and coming to analyze what the  
 7 information shows and what the public comments are and the  
 8 council, the Federal staff like myself and the staff committee  
 9 will learn an awful lot about what the users are doing now and  
 10 about what are the customary and traditional practices. An  
 11 example would be: When do people typically, you know, hunt  
 12 those and what methods do they use and what bag limits are  
 13 reasonable for people and traditional and to learn about  
 14 sharing and distribution networks and transportation methods  
 15 and the whole realm of kind of how you do it and when you do it  
 16 and how is it used. That information is very valuable to help  
 17 staff understand better what's going on in a region, what  
 18 subsistence is. It also is valuable, I think, for the staff  
 19 and the staff committee and the Federal Subsistence Board when  
 20 they're looking at proposals that might come from the public  
 21 and from the regional councils for changes in bag limits and  
 22 changes in seasons and methods and means and so forth to help  
 23 provide regulations that provide those customary and  
 24 additional uses.

25

26           So that whole pool of information about subsistence use  
 27 part of the process of gathering information to make  
 28 determinations. That information is also used when we're  
 29 reviewing regulation proposals and that sort of thing, so I  
 30 would again invite from the council here, if any of you know  
 31 people that would be particular knowledgeable or particular  
 32 communities that you think I should be sure I talk to about  
 33 uses in Unit 18. Not only do they go there and do they use it,  
 34 but how and when and, you know, distribution networks and that  
 35 sort of thing. I would find that very valuable in my work in  
 36 addressing the C&T process in Unit 18 to be sure that we do  
 37 include people on the fringes that are out in Unit 19 and  
 38 (E), for example. Thank you.

39

40           MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Mike. Gloria?

41

42           MS. MASCHMEYER: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say  
 43 that I had the opportunity of attending the meetings on  
 44 February 13th and 14th and was on the sidelines and heard a lot  
 45 comments from people, your people and the Federal people, in  
 46 what a historic time this is, and there was a lot of discussion  
 47 about how things have been handled in the past, and meaning  
 48 from a top-down approach, and there was a lot of talk at that  
 49 meeting about a bottom-up approach, and so I would encourage

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

you as a council to keep this in mind, that there is a trend towards this movement, and therefore you should really be thinking ahead to the customary and traditional uses. As Mike has mentioned, that process may change, and it may change quickly or it may take time. We really don't know at this point. But if it changes to the point where we're not addressing all of the C&T separately, which there is a question whether we have the resources to do that, then we're looking more at the councils of giving advice to the board and basically setting some of the procedures, and then the board will, you know, take it more from, you know, the council's input rather than the top-down input.

13

14 So I just wanted to stress to you that at that meeting that I attended, either there were a lot of comments on how this system and the process is changing, and I would encourage, you know, you to have hopefulness that this is how it's going to be in the future and work from that angle.

19

20 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Phil?

21

22 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. Herman and I were talking sort of about the same thing during the break, and we were both thinking, you, know, the State Advisory Board is a good place -- I mean, that's -- the people from each village -- I mean, wouldn't want to say who customarily uses what land, but people from the village is where you have the advisory boards, and somebody from each village, you might get a better idea of what people use, what resources, where, so why not involve them, the advisory boards, as much as possible.

31

32 MR. HUNTINGTON: Pollock, you had a question?

33

34 MR. SIMON: Yes. I'd like to ask a question on how far back you have to go in years to determine which village is qualified as subsistence user. To me, every villager of every village has been living off the land for years. Long before white people came around, we've been living off the land, so to me every village member is a qualified subsistence user, and I'm just wondering how far back in time you have to go to determine if a villager in a village is a qualified subsistence user.

43

44 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Simon, I think for many communities, there won't be the question about whether the community is in or out. It's going to be probably in because it has been there a long time and presumably if the resource has been around there a long time, there won't be any question about whether the community qualifies or not. I think that

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Will be -- for many communities, it won't take a lot of analysis. They'll be in.

3

4 I think there might be some areas where, because of changes in transportation methods over time or maybe because of the increase in population in some areas, people have begun over time to travel further to go into areas to hunt, then there might be the question of how long does a -- do residents from a community have to go have gone to an area to hunt to qualify, and there is no answer right now for how long that is. I think the questions that you raise are questions that we ask ourselves and questions that the staff committee and the Federal Subsistence Board are also grasping for, and I think that, you know, any discussion that occurs at the council level and at public meetings and so forth is going to be well-received to help address that. But there is no set number of years now that a community has to have used a resource to qualify for -- it may vary area to area, and I think we're just as you know, we're early enough along in this process that that question hasn't been resolved and may not be for a little while.

22

23 MR. SIMON: Yeah. Before villages were established, there were times when people used to roam the whole country following the game because some game was scarce, and there was a time when they used the whole land for -- and a time after the people sit in the village, there were more game, and now that they don't have to go far from the village, that doesn't necessarily mean that they haven't used this one corner of land. They have been using it before time.

31

32 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Pollock. I'd like to state again that if there's any comment from the public, just feel free to come on up to the mike and speak, and I'd like to have this open as possible. So anybody have any questions on this C&T determination, just feel free to come to the mike. I know we're spending a lot of time on this subject, but -- and we might be stressed for time, but I'd like to move on on the agenda now and maybe cover some of the other topics if there's any other questions. Vince?

41

42 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The next item to close out C&T is Upper Tanana and Copper Center, and I mentioned that earlier Upper Tanana, the eastern interior, asked for a delay in releasing the proposed rule so the communities could comment on that more. They're going to have a report and take -- draft their comments at a meeting next week. Copper Region -- both Upper Tanana and Copper Region, the lead agency is National Park Service. My understanding is they're going ahead with the

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

existing program and waiting for the board to decide if there's going to be any changes.

3

4 I didn't bring any of the time lines for the Copper Region, but it's not within the near future that there will be something out on the Copper River -- Copper Region, excuse me.

8

9 So if there's no questions on that, I'll go to H, which is regional boundary changes for western and North Slope regions. Okay. On that I will point you to Tab Number 9, which has a letter that you requested be drafted from your last meeting, and I think I'll turn the rest over to Steve to explain. But essentially in packet 9, you have the letter that was sent to the Park Service saying that this council wanted to be informed of what has happened with the boundary change issue and that maps be distributed to the communities of Alakaket, Akatna, Bettles, Evansville, and Wiseman, and Steve is here to respond to that and also discuss the next item in your packet, which is a letter and a map describing that. And if Steve doesn't have copies, I have -- I believe I have extra copies for public distribution. So I think I'll turn it over to Steve on that. Thank you. I do have extra copies, so the public -- they will be on the public table. Oh, you've got them, too. Okay.

26

27 MR. ULVI: Thank you, Vince. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make this quick. It's been going on for about a year-and-a-half, and if anyone would like me to just quickly illustrate it on the flip-chart, I'll be glad to do that. But we have a map here that I drew that I think fairly represents what the Elders and citizens of Anaktuvuk Pass would like to see in the way of a boundary change. This does originate with the residents of Anaktuvuk Pass, and there's a history of them being right on the line between Region 10 and your region, Region 6 here. They went to the Federal Board early on and got the boundary of the community drawn in so that Anaktuvuk Pass is in region 10. They're concerned that they use areas within Region 6 to the south, mostly the Upper John River and that country, as well as over to the Noatak, which is in region 8, Northwest Arctic. So they wanted to redraw that boundary so that all of their additionally used hunting and trapping areas would fall within Region 10. So they felt after trying several other alternatives this was the best way to go. We had a Subsistence Resource Commission Meeting in Anaktuvuk Pass, April of 1993, and there the Subsistence Resource Commission heard testimony of the effect that people would like to propose this boundary change. So the subsistence resource commission for Gates of the Arctic Park wrote a letter in support of this change. It's

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Something the Federal Board has to decide, and in response to your letter from late last year as well as just the normal public information process, I sent out a copy of this letter, which is just a quick summary of the history of this idea, and this map, which I think fairly represents what the residents and Elders of Anaktuvuk Pass would like to see changed to all of the communities that I thought could possibly be affected by this.

9

10 At the Northwest Arctic Federal Regional Council Meeting in Kotzebue, which I did attend, but I understand when they took up this issue, they felt, and I believe their formal response will be, we would like to see the residents of Anaktuvuk Pass go and talk personally to the residents of Natak, of Shungnak, of Kobuk, of some of those villages that might be affected in their region. And after they worked it out at the local IRA level or the local village level, then perhaps bring it back up to the Federal Council level.

19

20 I was at the North Slope Regional Council Meeting last week in Barrow, and they supported the concept and more or less came out in support of the residents of Anaktuvuk Pass.

23

24 So that leaves your region then as the third region that would be potentially affected by this proposed boundary change, and I know that the Federal Board is not going to deal with this at all until they feel they've gotten all the public opportunity to think about it and comment on if possible, and that would be a precedent-setting decision to change a boundary line, so it will be interesting to see what happens.

31

32 So I guess what you behave you, then, is the opportunity to ask questions if you have any about this in something I failed to cover, for them to decide what action you want to take, if any, at this stage.

36

37 MR. HUNTINGTON: We have two representatives on our board from that area and maybe they can put a -- have a little input into it. I think they would be more aware of the boundary changes than I am or some of the other board members are, so I'd like to hear from some of the other board members from Upper Koyukuk River area as to the way they feel on this boundary change? Pollock?

44

45 MR. SIMON: Okay. In your pack you have a -- there's a map showing the first change. This borderline now is just right alongside of village of Anaktuvuk, and this shaded is the one that they want their subsistence use area. So there's another line that they sure could -- in the shaded area that is

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



the proposed boundary line. So at the Subsistence Resource Commission meeting we agreed to make this boundary change.

3

4 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, the people of Anaktuvuk are very concerned with being on the boundary and not -- they utilize resources north and south, and being the only village in that -- there is no other village within the shaded area, and being the only village in that area, they felt that they should have the most say in management decisions regarding those resources within that boundary change, and that's their main reason for wanting that boundary change. They want to be able to have a say on seasons and bag limits and resources that is approximating 50 percent of their use. So they -- the Subsistence Resource Commission is unanimous in support of this boundary change.

16

17 MR. HUNTINGTON: So there doesn't seem to be any opposition to the boundary change on Upper Koyukuk area. I'm kind of wondering about the area over Noatak. It seems like they might be a couple hundred miles out of their area, really, and to try and include somebody else traditional hunting ground under their jurisdiction is -- I don't know. I think it might kind of self-defeating of their intentions. I don't know. It's up to the Northwest Arctic and I guess Arctic Slope to figure that one out, though. So Stan, do you have a question?

26

27 MR. NED: Yeah. (Inaudible - away from microphone) I'm sitting on that Subsistence Resource Commission, and I think a number of you, and it sounds like they're not (inaudible) generate hunting resources -- where the resources are. They don't have no check boundaries of (inaudible) things like that, you know, and they were telling us that they hunted all the way up into the park, all the way up throughout the park. So it's like, you know, we can't tell them how far they need to go to get the resources. (Inaudible) Maybe he can't hunt because, you know, (inaudible) that's like okay (inaudible). I can't see myself saying hey, you know, you can't go this far because -- if it's all right with the people (inaudible). I myself feel I have no arguments with them in where they set these new boundaries. If it's okay with the people up in Noatak, Kotzebue, Ambler, Shiniak, that's fine.

42

43 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. I think it should be agreed on both sides, you know. Whatever they can come up with would be okay.

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair?

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: Jack?

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. REAKOFF: As far as Region 6, the Western Interior  
Region, the boundary that's drawn, extension within Region 6,  
there's no opposition within that -- our -- what affects our  
portion of region, there's no opposition to that. The western  
boundary -- I know that people -- I know people in Anaktuvuk  
that trap over there in the Noatak and Nigu and that country,  
but they'll -- that's up to the Northwest region to deal with  
that. But as far as the portion that's within our region,  
there's no conflict there.

11  
12 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any more questions from Steve or....  
13

14 MR. MATHEWS: It would be best if you guys took action  
on this so it's clear to Steve and everyone else where this  
council stands, and it'd be easier through a motion and a vote  
on something.

18  
19 MR. REAKOFF: I'd like to make a motion to adopt the  
boundary change extension of Region 10 into Region 6 within our  
parameters of our region.

22  
23 MR. HUNTINGTON: Motion on the floor to adopt a  
boundary change recommendation. Is there a second?

25  
26 MR. COLLINS: I'll second it.  
27

28 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded to adopt  
a boundary change for Region 10 and Region 6. Questions?  
(Pause) All in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

31  
32 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.  
33

34  
35 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
Motion passed.

37  
38 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. That brings us up to an update on  
the staff committee's request on adequacy of area  
presentation. We talked about that earlier in the meeting,  
that you responded to that request of my asking for alternates,  
and there's been no response about the alternates. But the  
question of adequacy is going to be on the staff committee in  
its March meeting and on the board's agenda for its April  
meeting. So that pretty much -- unless there's other questions  
on the adequacy, that's the status of that.

47  
48 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Morgan, I have a question. Can we add  
another person on there or -- I'd recommend that if there's an  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

alternate chosen, somebody from the Upper Kuskokwim be on there. Like around my area there must be Eskimos, you know, in there. Up river there are mostly Indians and they're kind of different in their customary and traditional uses. I'd recommend or suggest that any new participants come up, that somebody from that area be selected.

7

8 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I believe the request is can we add another member to the council, make it a ten-member council, and that it be from the Upper Kuskokwim area. The answer to that is that would come up when your charter is up for renewal and your charter just passed January 31st, 1995, and I'm kind of scrambling here, but I believe it's only good -- the charter's only good for two years. So I think in late '96 you could change it at that time, but also the issue of additions to council is what started this whole process of having the staff committee ask, so they have not made a decision. Two other councils asked for additions, so maybe after the April meeting they will go out and ask again for other additions. But I also need to make it clear to you that the seats that you fill are not assigned to an area within the region. The panel process would have to reach out and make sure that there's a person for that area, but there's not a -- that number 7 is not assigned to the Wiseman area, as an example. So I hope that answers Mr. Morgan's question. You can ask for additional ones when your charter is back up again, and that it looks like the board will be addressing additions at this upcoming meeting.

29

30 Mr. Chairman, I think that moves us up to the old Business area, and there I'm not sure if I have them in the right order, the three issues that were added to the agenda. One was the Federal Register notice from the National Parks Service concerning same-day airborne hunting and then the mapping regulation clarification. The next one was wolf control, and I'm not -- I've lost the third one. Oh, the draft statement on management at Gates of the Arctic. So I don't know what order you wanted to take those up. Two of them are closely related, so it might be wise to put together the -- both of the National Park Service issues together as one. And just a reminder that the cover dish lunch was going to be scheduled for 1:00, so we're at 12:10 now.

43

44 MR. HUNTINGTON: Which one going to next?

45

46 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. I think we'll probably go to the issue of wolves that was brought up by Mr. Morgan. Maybe that's been resolved. I'm not sure.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, as I talked to you earlier,  
 maybe if you give me time, I'd rather see it in a proposal form  
 or -- and have the council vote on it. And so if you give me  
 time, maybe I'll have something written up, and then the  
 council can vote on it or discuss it. I think it's pretty  
 important, and now is the time to ask on it before it becomes a  
 real problem.

8

9 MR. HUNTINGTON: Maybe we can discuss it now and come  
 up with some kind of solution or a plan or later on in the day  
 do you want a little more time to think about it.

12

13 MR. MORGAN: Well, as I stated before, Mr. Chairman,  
 that's become the real problem around there. They're just  
 getting too many wolves, and they're killing a lot of moose,  
 you know. Even if we have to curtail our subsistence hunting  
 because of the wolves, you know, it's going to be even more  
 a problem. I think we should take care of the problem  
 before it really becomes a problem, you know. Before it goes  
 too far, and I wouldn't be bringing it up if it wasn't a  
 problem, you know, and as I mentioned before, maybe they can  
 have a bounty on wolves, maybe \$200.00. That way it will give  
 the people a chance to make some money and it will help protect  
 the moose and it will help control the wolves. But if we make  
 a proposal, we could say they could have a limit and be  
 monitored by Fish & Wildlife and make sure they don't wipe them  
 out completely, but to do nothing is -- I would be shirking my  
 responsibility to the people in my area. I feel that  
 subsistence users, they have more rights than wolves. That's  
 the reason I brought that up, and I'd like to have them vote on  
 it -- the council vote on it in a proposal form maybe later on.

32

33 MR. HUNTINGTON: Vince?

34

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Would you want to discuss that proposal  
 now?

38

39 MR. MORGAN: I'd have to write it up. It'd have to be  
 written up in proposal form, and if it please the council, we  
 could vote on it, or they could either do it now or later, you  
 know.

43

44 MR. HUNTINGTON: Henry, you got a question?

45

46 MR. DEACON: Yeah. We brought this up, too, last fall,  
 you know. Is it within the whole region that this was a  
 problem? I know it's a problem in my area, but is it the whole  
 region's problem? My question is: Is it. I know it's a

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

problem in my area, the wolf population.

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Maybe one of the biologists might be  
able to answer that.

5

6 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. I'm glad you are deferring to the  
biologists, so I'll defer to them to discuss the status of the  
wolf situation, and then I would like further discussion, what  
you mean by "proposal" and et cetera and timing of it. But I  
think we need to address the chances of having a bounty  
established.

12

13 MR. MORGAN: I kind of disagree with that. You know, I  
think that people who suffering the -- to tell what the  
problems are they're having and not to tell us -- somebody to  
come tell us, "No, you can't; you shouldn't do that." You  
know, it's our problem. I think the council themselves should  
have a say. We should hear from them, and that's a problem I  
see a lot of times. We hear from biologists or people from  
Washington say, "That's not a good idea," you know, and here,  
that's what we're here for, to bring that up. I think the  
council themselves should tell what they think, you know.  
That's my point.

24

25 MR. HUNTINGTON: Anybody have anything else to add to  
that? We can probably talk about this all day and not get  
nowhere, but got to discuss it sometime.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: I'd like to hear data from the biologists  
if they have it on what they've been observing this winter,  
what's going on. I know what's going on in the McGrath area,  
but I don't know the others. I'd like kind of an update if  
they have any information on those things.

34

35 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, maybe I'll -- just a minute. In  
my experience, I know we have a real problem around the Koyukuk  
area, and it's been growing, more and more, bigger packs in the  
last few years, and it's -- I think it's getting out of hand as  
far as the moose is -- you know, moose and the people that  
depend on the moose is concerned. It should be addressed and  
something should be done to put a little more control on the  
wolf population.

43

44 Jeff, do you have a question?

45

46 MR. DENTON: I can't speak real well for the Federal  
lands in and around the Aniak area 'cause those are YK Delta  
refuge lands to the south of the river there. There's not a  
representative from those folks here. I do not know right off

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

the top of my head what surveys they've been doing in there. I know they've been doing some wolf surveys in the past years, But wolf surveys, I'm quite sure, have not been done. Status of wolves, caribou, and moose relationships in that area, I'm sure that right now there's no work being done on that. I can speak for some of the BLM lands that are to the north of Aniak in only a cursory fashion simply because we did a moose survey in there last fall. Not an intensive survey by any means.

9  
10 We encountered one pack of wolves in the area between Aniak and Shageluk, and we had -- you know, that was actual sightings of the pack of wolves. They were on a kill. And we had evidence of possibly two other packs working that piece of country. You're talking a very large region, and until we would do an intensive type of wolf survey, we really don't have hard data to tell you what's going on there. You're talking a real expensive type of effort, and right now I guess we're not in the position to be doing that unless the board would direct us to do that.

20  
21 And also what's involved in most of that country, especially where the BLM lands are, is over 50 percent of that country is either non-Federal lands or corporation lands, and from my standpoint and my budget standpoints, if we don't have cooperation and cost-sharing in these kinds of surveys from the private landowners in those areas, it's going to make it difficult to do these things. It costs lots of dollars and there's lots of non-Federal lands involved, and we have to look at it on a cooperative basis from the corporations, the villages, the people that are really saying they're being most affected. They have a part to play on their own lands in these kinds of surveys, and as time goes on and fed budgets get shorter and shorter, there's going to be a much, much greater demand upon other landowners to play their part.

35  
36 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman?

37  
38 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes.

39  
40 MR. MORGAN: I'm also on that State Advisory Committee, and we have a meeting in March, and we'll probably be bringing this up, too, you know. You're talking about cooperation, you know, there's one way to do it, you know, to do something about it now. Even though they say it probably won't pass, at least we're making a statement saying that, you know, something needs to be done, and just because they say it won't pass, you know, who knows? If enough people say we should have it, maybe it will pass.

49  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. HUNTINGTON: Pollock?

2

3 MR. SIMON: Yes. I'd like to say that in the area  
 4 where I -- it seems like the wolf population is increasing,  
 5 500, and that would mean they would eat more moose, and from  
 6 the way it is in the past, you know, if you start killing off  
 7 the wolves, then a lot of people from the Lower 48 or someplace  
 8 will say, "Don't shoot the wolf, save the wolf." But as a  
 9 Native of Alaska, you know, we live off the land and we do have  
 10 to eat, too, and it seems like that is not considered, you  
 11 know. If we start killing the wolves, people get angry. But  
 12 as a native, we need to eat the moose too, you know, and I was  
 13 just wondering if there's too many wolves now, what's going to  
 14 be done about it.

15

16 MR. HUNTINGTON: Hollis?

17

18 MR. TWITCHELL: I can address the wolf situation in  
 19 Denali and at least pass the information on to you that I'm  
 20 aware of. Before I start, I would like to indicate to you that  
 21 the area within Denali National Park Preserve within your  
 22 region is limited primarily to the lands on the very edge of  
 23 the park preserve in Unit 19(C) and 19(D). So what I'm going  
 24 to be telling you is regarding wolf populations that are  
 25 primarily in Unit 20(C) and on the south side of Denali and  
 26 doesn't represent populations particularly in this region.

27

28 With that preference, the Park has completed a five-  
 29 year study on wolves at Denali, and in that study, it was  
 30 identified that there are approximately fourteen packs within  
 31 the boundaries of Denali National Park and Preserve. The  
 32 population has varied. Last year's census were approximately  
 33 30 wolves involved in those fourteen packs, the high point  
 34 being a little over 160 wolves several years ago, so the  
 35 current over the last several years has been a reduction in the  
 36 number of wolves in Denali. The Park considers the wolf  
 37 population to be a natural and healthy population in the area.

38

39 One of the things that I'd like to make the council  
 40 aware of is last year's proposal that was made to the Federal  
 41 Subsistence Board via the regional councils by the State  
 42 requesting that wolf seasons and bag limits for subsistence be  
 43 adjusted to coincide with State seasons and bag limits. That  
 44 proposal had a number of modifications and was -- in essence  
 45 portions of it were approved by the Federal Subsistence Board.  
 46 The result of that action for Denali subsistence hunters was  
 47 to the disadvantage of the subsistence users. In three of the  
 48 wildlife management units at Denali, the subsistence harvest  
 49 were reduced from ten wolves down to five wolves under a

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

Hunting authorization.

2

3           So that free-roaming wolves taken with a rifle under  
 4 the hunting authorization, we saw a reduction in half of the  
 5 allowable harvests that could occur.

6

7           Denali National Park did not support that proposal  
 8 Because we believed that the wolf populations were natural and  
 9 healthy and there was no biological reason to reduce harvests  
 10 of wolves. Nevertheless, that proposal went forward to the  
 11 Federal Subsistence Board and was approved, and so currently  
 12 subsistence hunters have reduced harvest levels at the State's  
 13 harvest levels.

14

15           That proposal also authorized an additional thirty days  
 16 of harvest for trapping in April beyond what was in existence  
 17 in the Federal program before. That particular period of time  
 18 is not very useful for subsistence users in our area since snow  
 19 cover, particularly on the north side of the range, is minimal  
 20 in April and travel and movement for subsistence users is  
 21 extremely limited by the lack of snow cover in the open water  
 22 channels and rivers. So thereby the thirty-day extension that  
 23 subsistence users received with last year's proposal was of  
 24 little merit to them. Concern was also expressed that the  
 25 quality of the fur in April was not desirable in terms of  
 26 harvest of wolves.

27

28           So again, to the information that we have available,  
 29 the population of wolves in Denali is considered to be natural  
 30 and healthy, and I raise the question again why a reduction in  
 31 subsistence harvest to wolves occurred when we had a population  
 32 that could sustain that harvest, simply to try to coincide the  
 33 Federal harvest with the State program.

34

35           MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Hollis. Maybe -- I'd like  
 36 to hear from either Tim over there, if he's not too busy or  
 37 Paul, as to what -- the wolf situation in this area. Any idea?  
 38 Well, I guess I'd like to know if there's -- what's the  
 39 situation on the wolf population in this area here. Is there  
 40 over-abundance of wolves or is there a problem?

41

42           MR. OSBORNE: There may have been. There's a tendency  
 43 in the local areas here that if people (inaudible - away from  
 44 microphone) wolves they just (inaudible) trapping and hunting  
 45 efforts. So I really don't get too many complaints from the  
 46 unit 24 managers. There is -- people have been talking about  
 47 in the 21(D) area (inaudible) Nulato. I -- can you hear me  
 48 back there?

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515



1 MR. HUNTINGTON: Can you come to the mike?

2

3 MR. OSBORNE: If it's in Unit 24 here there's not a  
4 problem 'cause it may mean -- taken care of by people  
5 themselves going out and increasing their effort if they feel  
6 that there's too many wolves. In 21(D) it's a lot more wooded  
7 countryside and it's a little more difficult for people to do  
8 that. But I've been trying to distribute some of the snares  
9 that are left over from the control program to people to show  
10 them the kind of break-away snares that we're using that are  
11 able to catch wolves, but moose are able to get out of them. I  
12 want to educate people on how to set more efficient, but as far  
13 as far as any efforts, we're not doing anything ourselves.

14

15 MR. HUNTINGTON: Sharon?

16

17 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Yeah. What about 21(B) as in boy?

18

19 MR. OSBORNE: That area, the trapping pressure's gone  
20 way downhill and very few people are going to be trapping there  
21 now, and there's plenty of moose in there and wolves. There's  
22 plenty of wolves, and we were actually talking about trying to  
23 do a wolf census in there this spring, but that didn't come to  
24 pass, to see how many wolves there were. We did a census last  
25 year in 21(D), the entire unit, all 12,000 square miles, and we  
26 came up with seven wolves per thousand-square kilometers, which  
27 is a unit that we use for wolf density, and then you can use  
28 that to compare with other studies: Denali Park and 21(A) and  
29 other areas. It's kind of a standard that they use. I know  
30 Jack Whitman just finished a census last Monday down in 19 --  
31 is it D? North portion from McGrath up into Minchumina, and  
32 they came up with, I think, 10.2 wolves per thousand-square  
33 mile area. This is an initial, preliminary estimate. He  
34 hasn't come up with a final one yet.

35

36 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Then you have no idea what it is  
37 in the Novi area?

38

39 MR. OSBORNE: No. We did know a couple years ago, but,  
40 of course, the information's older now.

41

42 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: But it's probably increased by  
43 now.

44

45 MR. OSBORNE: Correct.

46

47 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Thank you.

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: Tom?

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. TOM ELEY: I'll just mention a couple of things  
3 that -- or one thing particularly that Mr. Denton mentioned  
4 earlier and Tim also alluded to, was that we did have a census  
5 plan this year for Unit 24, and it was going to be a  
6 cooperative project with Fish & Game, Fish & Wildlife Service,  
7 Venetie Refuge, Kuyukak Refuge, BLM, and Park Service, and  
8 because of the budget cuts with the newer administration and  
9 all the Federal agencies are taking major budget cuts, that  
10 census was not completed, and that may be a problem we have in  
11 the future. As you all lean on us like you should for  
12 information, we may or may not have the money to provide the  
13 information that you request. Novi is a good example of an  
14 area we need more information on, and whether we'll have the  
15 money in the future or not, address that issue, remains to be  
16 seen.

17  
18 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Sir, could you -- or maybe Tim  
19 would know what it was a couple years ago, the rate -- the  
20 number of wolves per whatever kilometers you use?

21  
22 MR. ELEY: Do you have that, Tim?

23  
24 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: And it's increased from that.

25  
26 MR. ELEY: I think the census last -- was it last year,  
27 Paul, for 21(D)? Had 260 wolves for the whole game management  
28 unit.

29  
30 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: That's D as in dog?

31  
32 MR. ELEY: D as in dog.

33  
34 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: I'm interested in B as in boy.  
35 Yeah.

36  
37 MR. ELEY: Yeah.

38  
39 MR. OSBORNE: I think it's 75-90, is our estimate that  
40 we usually come up with, and I think that comes out to be six-  
41 and-a-half or seven wolves per thousand-square kilometers.

42  
43 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: And that's in B?

44  
45 MR. OSBORNE: In B, and that was in 1992. One or two,  
46 believe, and that's the last time we've got an estimate.

47  
48 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Tom. Thank you. Is there  
49 any more discussion on the -- Stan, do you have a question?

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. STAN NED: Yeah. I do a lot of traveling for the  
Tanana Chiefs and I think that (inaudible - away from  
microphone) and it seems like there's a big increase in wolf in  
all the villages: Ruby, Holy Cross, Alakaket (inaudible). So  
we know that it's going to be a problem, for example, moose  
will pop the traps or (inaudible). There is a problem, so I  
think we need (inaudible) as soon as possible.

9  
10 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Stan.  
11

12 MR. NED: Well, my name is Stanley Ned. I work for  
Tanana Chiefs and the Wildlife Parks Division, and I do a lot  
of traveling throughout the villages, and from what I've been  
hearing, is that there's a really lot of -- there's a big  
increase in the wolf population all over: Alakaket, here in  
Huslia, Holy Cross, down in Ruby. In fact, I wrote a letter to  
Tom Eley proposing that we do a moose study in Nowitna because  
of that problem. They're telling us there's a lot of wolves  
all over the place, and it seemed like the Federal and State is  
not seeing that as a problem yet. But we know. People that  
live out in the village know that it's going to be a problem  
within a couple of years.

24  
25 I think the sooner we address this problem, the better  
off we're going to be later. So we need to come to some kind  
of consensus thing, that this is how we're going to control the  
wolf population.

29  
30 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, do we have any suggestions from  
the board members as to what route we should go?

32  
33 MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, what we did in the  
Grath area and this area that was just surveyed where they  
have the 10.2, we've for a number of years now have been  
requesting intensive management, proposed that the State do  
that, and that's where it's now. It's a proposal that's in  
that the board will have to act on. They could initiate a  
proposal like that in the Aniak area, too. It would have to be  
when it's open in that area, but....(pause)

41  
42 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the appropriate time for a  
proposal like that would be this coming fall when the proposed  
rule is out, or another way of saying it: The call for  
proposals under the federal program. So that would be a time  
to bring up this; if it is a proposal, to establish a bounty or  
something similar to that for the Federal program. The State  
program already mentioned is the intensive management as....

49  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. And I think you could nominate  
 2 that -- you can make a nomination of proposal at any time to  
 3 the State.

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Right.

6

7 MR. COLLINS: So there's two actions. There's one that  
 8 you could get either the local advisory -- Fish & Game Advisory  
 9 Commission -- someone would need to draft that and submit it to  
 10 the area down there.

11

12 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman? For now maybe we could make  
 13 a statement to the State Legislature saying we support their --  
 14 I think they have a vote on a lift station for a boundary of  
 15 \$400.00 on wolves, you know. May we could make a statement  
 16 saying here we support that for now until we can get our own  
 17 proposal. Let them know we feel that it's -- we know it's a  
 18 problem and we feel this would do something about it. Maybe we  
 19 can draft a letter saying we support or something saying we  
 20 support that \$400.00 bounty that they're going to be voting on.

21

22 MR. MATHEWS: Well, if I understand you correctly,  
 23 you're saying that the council could make a statement to the  
 24 fact that they support a bounty on wolves. Are you also  
 25 indicating that the proposal that the Ray Collins area put in  
 26 was for intensive management? And I -- that does not address  
 27 bounties. That addresses other management tools that could be  
 28 used. So later on in the agenda, not to put it off, there's  
 29 potential to look at Board of Game proposals, and that's one of  
 30 the state-wide proposals, is the intensive management one that  
 31 Ray has talked about. So you could draft a statement. If  
 32 you're looking at a proposal for the Federal program, it would  
 33 be better to do that this fall. The question of the intensive  
 34 management one, I'll have to advise you that that is pertaining  
 35 to State lands and not to Federal lands. Doesn't mean you  
 36 can't take some action in the area, but you don't have  
 37 jurisdiction.

38

39 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, should we write a letter  
 40 saying -- or something saying we support the State's efforts  
 41 for -- or let the guys in Juneau know we support that bounty  
 42 process on the wolves? If we -- you know, if we're out of  
 43 line -- but I feel that these are problems. A lot of times  
 44 those wolves, they don't stay on State land. They go on  
 45 Federal land, too, you know. They don't know the boundaries.  
 46 But I think we need to do something. We can't just wait and  
 47 wait and do more studies, but it might be too late. So how do  
 48 we write a letter or something, a statement, to that effect?

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

1 MR. MATHEWS: You could pass -- your options are to  
 pass a resolution that you could target to, you know, the whole  
 Gamut, meaning from the Secretary of Interior to the Federal  
 Subsistence Board or to individual land-managing agencies. You  
 know, you have that option to pass a resolution to that effect.  
 6 I mean, that's always your option on anything. The other is a  
 proposal this fall, and then the third one would be if you  
 decide to discuss State Board of Game proposals, is to look at  
 the intensive management proposal.

10

11 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I think there's another  
 problem we could address too, and that is that we don't have  
 accurate information on numbers because of cutbacks in Federal  
 funding and so on, and we could draft a letter stating that in  
 all of our area we see growing wolf populations and we're  
 concerned that the Federal agencies are not gathering  
 sufficient data on censusing so that -- on which to make  
 management decisions and so on and request that they address  
 that problem, that before we do end up with a crash in moose  
 populations or whatever, 'cause I think anybody that makes a  
 decision's going to have to have the biology first. The public  
 demands now they can't just make a decision without having the  
 biological data. So at a minimum, we could be drafting a  
 letter requesting that there be funds to do that, to be  
 monitoring what's happening in the moose population.

26

27 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman? That's what we're all here  
 for, to let people know that -- from our area what it looks  
 like, you know, and in a way, that's kind of a census type  
 thing, you know, for -- like, we can write a letter saying we  
 support the State's wolf, you know, bounty thing and do a study  
 like you were saying, you know. But for now we could see -- so  
 we don't know what our action would be right now. I'm kind of  
 new at this, too.

35

36 MR. HUNTINGTON: I have a recommendation. Maybe we can  
 have it in the form of a motion to accept Ray's recommendation  
 on writing a letter, if anyone would like to make a motion to  
 that effect.

40

41 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: I so move.

42

43 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved to write a letter to  
 the appropriate agencies concerning the wolf studies in our  
 area and the whole western interior. Is there a second?

46

47 MR. COLLINS: I'll second it.

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded to write

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

a letter to the Federal and State agency concerning the wolf control study. Any questions?

3

4 MR. MORGAN: I think we should be stronger than that.  
5 I think we should write a letter saying, you know, that there's  
6 a problem. We know it's a problem, and if they do more  
7 studies, you know, by the time all the studies are done, it'll  
8 be too late. I think we need to do something a little stronger  
9 than that. That's the way I feel.

10

11 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any suggestions as to what might be  
12 stronger?

13

14 MR. MORGAN: Write a proposal for a wolf bounty or a  
15 letter saying we support the State's efforts to have a vote on  
16. You know, that way the guys in Juneau will know that, you  
17 know, we see the problem and it is a problem and they should do  
18 something about it and have our own proposal later on. I think  
19 just writing a letter saying we should do a study is not strong  
20 enough. That's the way I feel. A study is too late.

21

22 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, we're ready for a vote.

23

24 MR. DEACON: The last couple of years Tanana Chiefs had  
25 their conference, and they suggest that wolves be bounty or  
26 killed, you know. I don't know what kind of response we ever  
27 got from that from the State, and like Mr. Morgan says, time to  
28 take action now and just get it over with. I don't want to be  
29 talking about it again next fall, the same thing over. We did  
30 that last October. We should have had an answer by now, you  
31 know. It's time to take action, like I said, so let's do it.  
32 You guys know if the (inaudible - mumbled speech) support it.

33

34 MR. HUNTINGTON: Hollis?

35

36 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the reason I proposed  
37 writing a letter and asking that they fund studies is that the  
38 way the situation is now, if any of the agencies propose  
39 managing wolves without having biological data to support it,  
40 it would be stopped by the courts. They almost have to prove  
41 that there's problems, so they've got to have data in order to  
42 do anything. We could ask them to do something, but that  
43 wouldn't result in it because even if they went in and  
44 instituted a bounty or something else and didn't have data that  
45 would support that, it would be stopped by the courts. So  
46 they've got to get out there and do the censusing and see how  
47 many wolves there are in relation to their prey to demonstrate  
48 that there's a problem. Then you can base management decisions  
49 on it. So I think that's a first step. That's why I

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

was.... (pause)

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Um-hum.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: And I think the letter could state also  
6 that there is growing concern and list the various areas that  
7 our members are from where they feel that there is a problem  
8 that needs to be looked at in the letter.

9

10 MR. DEACON: Are you stating in the letter a timetable?  
11 That we need a decision by, let's say, April or something. Or  
12 sooner. Or sooner.

13

14 MR. HUNTINGTON: Probably like tomorrow for them, yeah.  
15 Well, they're not known to act too fast on stuff like that, so  
16 I'm not holding my breath waiting for the answer. I think we  
17 can do what you, you know, just discussed and send a letter and  
18 get a wolf study done first. So all in favor of the motion  
19 signify by saying aye.

20

21 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

22

23 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
24 Motion carries. So we'll have Vince write up a letter with all  
25 the information on it.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: I sure hope it's in the transcript  
28 early because there was a lot of information, and I will be  
29 in consultation with you, Mr. Chairman, to make sure I capture  
30 correctly, and I would encourage you and I to consult with  
31 others that voted on this.

32

33 MR. HUNTINGTON: Um-hum.

34

35 MR. MATHEWS: Thank you.

36

37 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, can we make a statement  
38 saying we support the State's -- how do you say? They're going  
39 to vote on the wolf bounty thing, you know. Can we make some  
40 kind of statement saying we support that and put it to a vote?

41

42 MR. COLLINS: I think there's a place here where we  
43 support proposals, wasn't there? Was that coming up in the  
44 agenda?

45

46 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. I'm not sure where it is, but there  
47 is a spot where we were going to look at proposals because you  
48 drafted proposals to the Board of Game, and it'd be wise for  
49 you to comment on those, that you still agree with them. So we

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

can open up the process to the State proposals, but we'll have to lean on local expertise on the analysis of that. But anyway, those are statewide proposals, intensive management, and we have State proposal books here to look at on that. But again, it's not within your jurisdiction, but you can decide to comment on them.

7

8 MR. HUNTINGTON: Hollis?

9

10 MR. TWITCHELL: I just wanted to let the council be aware that the Park Service has specific mandates in its management, addressed both in the Park Service Organic Acts as well as ANILCA, that the Park Service is not to manage for a particular species and that we do not have the authority to use predator control to manage for a particular species. So intensive management being applied towards Park Service lands will not likely be received or be allowed to be conducted. So if this council or if the board moves towards any sort of predator control on wolves, it will not be applicable on national park lands, and this is why it's particularly a concern to me that the legitimate mechanisms for harvest such as the trapping and hunting not be restricted unless there is a biological reason for the reduction, and that's why the wolf situation in Denali was a particular concern for me, since basically subsistence users gave up the potential to harvest five wolves annually under a hunting authority.

27

28 But again, be aware that if you do pass the resolution on a motion or proposal and it goes to the Federal Subsistence Board for predator control on park lands, it's not going to be applicable because of our over-riding mandates for how we manage.

33

34 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. Are there any restrictions in the works now for predator control like for trapping? I mean proposed restrictions in the works now?

38

39 MR. TWITCHELL: We'll get into that when we get into the same-day airborne and the clarification on taking free-ranging animals with a rifle under the trapping authorizations. But there's no current program designed for predator control on National Park Service lands. I don't know if I answered your question or not.

45

46 MR. MORGAN: I don't know how to put it. I guess you kind of answered my question.

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any other questions/discussions on

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



Wolf control study or on the subject? Yes, Phil?

2

3 MR. GRAHAM: Not about wolves, but since you brought  
that up, you don't manage for a particular species in the  
National parks. What do you manage for? I mean, for the --  
that ecosystem or -- I don't -- maybe you could explain that.

7

8 MR. TWITCHELL: Okay. It might help if I read directly  
from Congress in the legislative history or legislative record  
for ANILCA. That might shed some light on it.

11

12 "In discussing subsistence uses of wildlife in NPS  
areas under ANILCA, Congress stated it is contrary to the  
National Park Service concept to manipulate habitats or  
populations to achieve maximum utilization of resources.  
Rather, the National Park System concept requires  
implementation of management policies which strive to maintain  
natural abundance, behavior, diversity, and ecological  
integrity of native animals as part of their ecosystem, and  
that concept should be maintained. It is expected that the  
National Park Service will take appropriate steps when  
necessary to ensure that consumptive uses of fish and wildlife  
populations within National Park Service units not be allowed  
to adversely disrupt the natural balance which has been  
maintained for thousands of years. Accordingly, the National  
Park Service will not engage in habitat manipulation or control  
of other species for the purpose of maintaining subsistence  
uses within the National Park System units."

29

30 So the concept is that an ecosystem concept, natural  
abundance, and diversity of native populations.

32

33 MR. GRAHAM: Natural boundaries.

34

35 MR. TWITCHELL: That's correct. So manipulating a  
population or a predator to enhance another species, moose or  
caribou for instance, is not a program that we're free to  
implement. So if consequently, if you're concerned about  
harvest of a predator, the harvests that are allowed cannot be  
viewed as being a driving factor for predator control. So what  
was saying before is the legitimate subsistence harvest of  
wolves under the current program is the only mechanism that you  
could increase harvest under a hunting license, for instance,  
and the bag limits associated with it, and just recently we  
experienced a reduction in that opportunity.

46

47 MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. You're saying whether they  
harvested -- whether the bag limit was five or ten wouldn't  
matter. It wouldn't matter if a trapper took ten. It wouldn't

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

affect the -- it wouldn't manipulate the....

2

3 MR. TWITCHELL: No, not in our view. That was an  
4 authorized subsistence harvest under the hunting authority of  
5 ten wolves.

6

7 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, is there any more discussion?  
8 It's getting close to lunch. I don't know if we should break  
9 or go to the next thing on our agenda. Okay. We'll talk about  
10 after lunch. Break for lunch.

11 (Off record)

12 (On record)

13

14 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. I would like to get the meeting  
15 back in order. Can everyone take their seats, please? (Pause)  
16 I'll call the meeting back to order. We have one member still  
17 on the way, but she should be here pretty shortly, so we'll go  
18 ahead and get started and go to the next item on the agenda  
19 under new business.

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: The next item on the agenda is the two  
22 old business items you added dealing with Park Service and the  
23 Federal Register notice dealing with same-day airborne and the  
24 status of the draft statement from Gates of the Arctic. So  
25 I'll defer to -- both of those were brought up by Jack and  
26 Steve Ulvi.

27

28 MR. ULVI: Vince, Mr. Chairman. I guess in the  
29 interest of time and the best situation for the council here,  
30 perhaps you could tell me exactly which of these issues you  
31 want to deal with first and what you want to know, and I'll try  
32 to give you that background information or information to help  
33 you decide if you want to take action of some sort.

34

35 MR. REAKOFF: I have concerns about, as I stated  
36 yesterday Federal agencies utilizing the Federal Register to  
37 pass regulations that affect customary and traditional use and  
38 seasons and bag limits under Subpart B of the Federal Process,  
39 and I drafted a statement of concern to be inserted into the  
40 draft regional council report, and I have a thing on the  
41 Subsistence Research Commission for the Gates of the Arctic.  
42 December I received a statement from management that was  
43 supposed to be at our January SRC meeting, but we didn't get to  
44 it, and I have a question. There were management implications  
45 that statement for management that affected subsistence  
46 users, and I was -- wanted to ask Steve about what's the  
47 deadlines for comment on that and when will that be adopted and  
48 all our SRC review that before it's adopted.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. ULVI: Mr. Chairman? Yeah, Jack. I guess working  
 2 backwards, it should be adopted as a very general statement for  
 3 the direction for Gates of the Arctic Parks management very  
 4 soon, in the next few weeks. It is normally -- it's not a  
 5 planning document; it's not a managing document in the specific  
 6 use of that term. It's a very general document to be changed  
 7 every couple of years, in very general ways lays out what the  
 8 park issues are, what the land status is, who the players are,  
 9 adjacent landowners, and all of that in very general terms, and  
 10 then from that twenty- or thirty-page document, then these  
 11 other management documents evolve: resource management plans,  
 12 general management plans, research plans, all of the very  
 13 specific things that if in fact those specific action items or  
 14 projects have anything to do with subsistence, then there  
 15 generally is an analysis of that project or plan, an 810  
 16 analysis; or certainly the SRC and bodies like this would have  
 17 a chance to take a look at that.

18

19 It's my boss's contention, the superintendent of the  
 20 park, and the Park Service's contention that the statement for  
 21 management is a general document that kind of directs the very  
 22 general management of the park and, in fact, it's normally not  
 23 circulated to the public, it's normally not circulated to other  
 24 agencies, and in this case was decided to circulate it to  
 25 Native corporations, the State of Alaska, our subsistence  
 26 resource commissioners all received a copy of it, and the  
 27 public has been invited to comment. So there was in a way an  
 28 informal public process and comment period for a document that  
 29 normally, and in fact in law and policy, does not require  
 30 public input, and I do think subsistence is certainly mentioned  
 31 in there. Subsistence and subsistence management is a very  
 32 important issue for Gates of the Arctic National Park. But the  
 33 point I'm trying to make is that normally there is very little  
 34 public comment opportunity on such a general plan and that in  
 35 this case there has been quite a bit of opportunity.

36

37 So I guess I would again repeat that it's a contention  
 38 of my boss and the regional director that there was more than  
 39 adequate input for this plan for its limited use and  
 40 application and that the specific actions or policies or  
 41 regulations that may come through different plans and different  
 42 processes will be, you know, put before this group and the  
 43 Subsistence Resource Commission and any other affected party.  
 44 Jack, you as an individual or you as a Subsistence Resource  
 45 Commission member certainly, hopefully will comment in writing  
 46 and/or phone call to the superintendent on what you feel may be  
 47 the shortcomings of that broad, philosophical kind of a  
 48 statement in the statement for management, and any other  
 49 members of the public are certainly welcome, also. But they

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

are trying to finalize that plan by early -- mid-March. It's been out and available for comment for two or three months now.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman? I have -- we were supposed  
6 to look at this statement for management plan in our last  
7 meeting, and I would like to reiterate that the Resource  
8 Commission didn't get to this subject. But there was one part  
9 in this management plan -- statement from management regarding  
10 designating lynx as an endangered species, and I don't -- this  
11 kind of goes along with the free-ranging furbearer problem, and  
12 sort of gets plugged in and then it's hard to unplug it, and  
13 would -- the only reason I brought up this statement from  
14 management is that's just an example. There's in this  
15 document -- I can't find it off-hand. There's a statement that  
16 lynx are under consideration to be designated as an endangered  
17 species and there's no factual, biological basis for that.

18

19 And so this goes along with my whole contention, that  
20 any customary and traditional use, determination, or seasons  
21 and bag limits that affects subsistence must go through the  
22 Federal Board process, and whether they're mixed in with the  
23 management plan for parks or whatever, they should all be  
24 brought forth in a proposal form and submitted to the  
25 Federal Board, which goes through this regional council, and  
26 then on to the fed- -- that way it has the wide range of  
27 discussion among the people who are most affected, and that's  
28 why I brought this out to light to the council. Whether this  
29 -- I feel that the Resource Commission should review that,  
30 but that's something between the Resource Commission and  
31 Gates' office.

32

33 But if it's okay with the council, I could read -- I've  
34 drafted a -- in regards to the -- it's triggered by the  
35 Park Service's definition of trapping and -- which is going to  
36 have wide ranges of ramifications to the subsistence users, and  
37 would like to read this, what I have written for submission  
38 be inserted into the report at this time, and this will be  
39 under the title of Submission of Proposals. "The Western  
40 Interior Council to the Federal Subsistence Board feels the  
41 formulation of regulations modifying customary and traditional  
42 uses and seasons and bag limits by the federal agencies needs  
43 addressing. It is the position of the council, if approved,  
44 regarding federal agencies that recently published in the  
45 Federal Register for comment, regulations regarding definitions  
46 that, in fact, change C&T uses and seasons and bag limits.  
47 This proposal to the Federal Register affects rural subsistence  
48 users on park lands. It is our position that to protect the  
49 integrity of the federal subsistence program and the meaningful

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

role of the councils and rural residents, federal agencies shall submit proposals to the Federal Board process. The publication and adoption by the individual agencies by the register process of C&T seasons and bag limits bypasses the rural residents' meaningful role in proposal formulation. Announcements are made in urban newspapers and meetings for public comment were primarily held in Anchorage and Fairbanks. These are urban areas. The federal subsistence program provides the best and most exposure to the local rural residents for comments based on a long, on-the-ground working knowledge of the resources."

12

13 And when that proposal was first sent forth, the meetings that were held were held in Anchorage and Fairbanks. They weren't held in the -- these are regulations affecting subsistence users on park lands, and they're holding meetings in urban centers and publishing in urban newspapers. I took exception to that, and I feel that this is a bad precedent for the agencies to pursue, is to buy the federal regional councils and Federal Board, and I would like to make a motion for submittal to our report of this last thing that I read.

22

23 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is that a motion?

24

25 MR. REAKOFF: That's a motion.

26

27 MR. HUNTINGTON: Motion on the floor to accept the matter? Is there a second? A second?

29

30 MR. DEACON: Second.

31

32 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any discussion? A question? (Pause)  
33 All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

34

35 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

36

37 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
38 Motion carries.

39

40 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman? I was wondering if the council would also like to make comment to the Park Service regarding that proposal, whether they would like to enumerate some things that are wrong with that proposal and what -- the effects that that proposal would have. I haven't drafted anything, but some of the effects are that it changes customary and traditional practices, that for years people would go to that camp and shoot muskrats with a 22-rifle under the trapping license. The hunting season wasn't even open. It was all under the trapping license. It will be -- if, indeed, they do

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

adopt that definition on park lands, we will have to propose and change all of the hunting of furbearer bag limits to no limit, this to align with the customary and traditional use of the trapping license.

5

6 The other thing about this trapping license, the trapping -- the hunting license expires December 31. The trapping license goes to the following October to allow people to access their camps and don't have to come out and re-  
10 license. They would therefore be in violation if they shot a furbearer after that time frame.

12

13 I think that it would be way easier for the Park Service to align their definition with the long-standing state and the customary and traditional shooting of free-ranging furbearers, and it would cost tremendous amounts of more time for our councils, all ten councils, to change all the hunting regulations to furbearers to no limit and time and staff committees and money and paperwork. We've got papers coming out of our ears. It would just be way easier for the Park Service to rescind their register proposal and align their language with customary and traditional practices.

23

24 And those are some of the reasons that I found is wrong with that proposal.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, you do have a copy of what he's talking about, the Federal Register notice. That's the one that was handed out just to make sure, and I or Gloria will get a copy of your statement and make a copy of that and incorporate it as the motion.

32

33 MR. REAKOFF: Well, it's coming out of the machine over there. Isn't the transcript coming up on....(pause)

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Well, the transcripts, there's a delay on that....

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: Oh.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: ....and I'd rather move ahead with it. So what we'll do is get your copy and I'll get a copy and give back the original of your statement so you have that.

44

45 MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. I don't know if any other council members had anything else to insert to that.

47

48 MR. HUNTINGTON: You stated that you wanted a letter from this body?

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. I would like the council to  
3 comment to the Park Service. They're asking for comments, and  
4 I think that the council should comment, state reasons why --  
5 what's wrong with this changing to their definition, and I make  
6 a motion to that effect.

7  
8 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. There's a motion in effect to  
9 have the staff draft up a letter to that effect.

10  
11 MR. MATHEWS: There was a motion earlier for a letter  
12 to incorporate the statement and that's already passed. Are  
13 you having a motion now just to comment?

14  
15 MR. REAKOFF: The motion now is to draft the comments  
16 and reasons why -- what's wrong with this Park Service  
17 Federal Register proposal to initiate their definitions. When  
18 I say "initiate," because this definition was made up in 1982,  
19 and now they want to enforce it. It's 1995. For thirteen years  
20 they didn't enforce this definition, and I want to comment that  
21 this is longstanding, customary and traditional practices in my  
22 whole statement there. But I want this sent to the Park  
23 Service. Council should comment to the Park -- they're asking  
24 for comments and we want to comment to them, also.

25  
26 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman? I think -- I'm not trying  
27 to defer the motion or anything like that. I think it would be  
28 better to discuss this before you make the motion 'cause I'm  
29 not sure the other council members know the details of this,  
30 and draft -- I can provide what I know of it, and the Park  
31 Service can also fill in on that, what this is all saying,  
32 'cause Jack is immediately going to the -- this is not asking  
33 for comment, to my knowledge. This was a clarification, and  
34 that's why I think it would be best to explain it before you  
35 pass some kind of motion on it so it's clear.

36  
37 MR. HUNTINGTON: Steve?

38  
39 MR. ULVI: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can do that.  
40 Essentially in a nutshell, for about the last six years the  
41 Park Service, because of State of Alaska same-day airborne and  
42 and and shoot trapping proposals and things like that over the  
43 years, as well as Fish & Wildlife Service and other agencies,  
44 there's been a tug of war going on as to what's appropriate  
45 certain Federal lands with State regulations. So all along  
46 the Park Service has felt that it's inappropriate to take any  
47 animal same-day airborne in park areas, where as with State law  
48 and regulations, there are proposals constantly coming up for  
49 same-day airborne, whether it's trapping or hunting. As you  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

know, we have same-day hunt on caribou right now in a couple of  
 2MU's in the state.

3

4 So the Park Service dusted off this six-year-old  
 5 proposal, more or less, that did go through a public comment  
 6 period. I believe it was in '89 and some in '87, both in front  
 7 of the State Game Board as well as public meetings in Anchorage  
 8 and Fairbanks and a number of smaller, rural communities.

9

10 So I'm not here to say it was a mistake on the part of  
 11 the Park Service to dust this off and bring it out again a year  
 12 ago and say it's time that we go forward with this regulation  
 13 on prohibiting same-day airborne. I'm not saying that, you  
 14 know, this letter from the Koyukuk River Fish & Game Advisory  
 15 Committee, which I just saw for the first time yesterday, they  
 16 sent out in December strongly commenting on the lack of a  
 17 proper comment period. The word didn't get to the villages.  
 18 We know that now and it was a mistake. That's all there is too  
 19 to. So there is an extended comment period coming into play  
 20 here soon for thirty more days.

21

22 For the part that Jack has been talking about here, is  
 23 the use of firearms for trapping in park areas.

24

25 MR. REAKOFF: It was stated yesterday that there's  
 26 been -- the airborne hunting part of it has gone on. There's  
 27 been a divergence in the trapping definition, is that now it's  
 28 separate comment/separate subject. So as far as the airborne  
 29 hunting part of it, it's not part of the -- of what I'm  
 30 commenting on. It's now been divided, and we're discussing the  
 31 definition only, not the airborne hunting part of it, and  
 32 that's what was told to us yesterday, that it was divided, the  
 33 part and the -- and what Steve is saying, is that the comment  
 34 period's coming up in thirty days. This council won't meet  
 35 until next October. If we want to comment on this thing, we  
 36 have to comment on it now.

37

38 MR. ULVI: That's right, Mr. Chairman, and I'm just  
 39 trying to provide some background information. But if you look  
 40 at that Federal Register, the proposed reg there, you'll see  
 41 "same-day airborne." That's what it is about. There was also  
 42 this portion that reiterated a regulation we already have on  
 43 the books since 1981, as Jack said, that the Park Service  
 44 interprets use of a firearm in trapping to mean that you can't  
 45 it unless you're shooting an animal that's already in a  
 46 trap.

47

48 So I was just trying to give you enough background so  
 49 that you know that because of the concerns that were raised

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515



primarily by the North Slope Borough, primarily by Anaktuvuk Pass, about this, because it's been on the books since '81, but nobody really realized it. It hasn't been enforced. There's no plans to go out and enforce it now. It's just it's one of those things that all of a sudden a bunch of people realized they were very uncomfortable with. So that part of the proposal has -- there's a comment period now that's been extended, and in fact, you know, this body can comment to the regional director and make your views, your concerns, the background information, the kinds of things Jack was pointing out, which I think are very appropriate, as to why you feel it's unnecessary for the Park Service to prohibit use of firearms in trapping. Anyway, that's kind of a general background.

15

16 There is a comment period coming up. If you were to draft a letter and send it now, then it would certainly be considered along with the other comments from the North Slope Borough, the Mayor's Office, Anaktuvuk Pass, as well as our Subsistence Resource Commission wrote a strongly-worded letter a few weeks back. So that commenting period has been extended because of the concerns expressed.

23

24 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Steve. Well, there's a motion on the floor. Was there a second?

26

27 UNIDENTIFIED: Second.

28

29 MR. HUNTINGTON: We have a second. It's been moved and seconded to draft a letter to the National Parks Service on concerns that Jack stated, and maybe Jack can pretty well work with Vince on that.

33

34 MR. REAKOFF: I'll work with Vince and Gloria on the seasons. I should job down....(pause)

36

37 MR. HUNTINGTON: And if it's possible, could you get a copy to the other board members as soon as possible?

39

40 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. Maybe on the next break we can work something out.

42

43 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. That'll be fine. Any questions?

45

46 UNIDENTIFIED: Question.

46

47 MR. HUNTINGTON: The question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
 Motion carries. We have another topic under old business, and  
 5 think Jack got some more information on that.

6

7 MR. REAKOFF: I think we've covered the statement from  
 Management and then we've covered the free-ranging furbearer  
 9 subject with this -- our report insertion and then our comment  
 10 the Federal Board, and that covered....

11

12 MR. HUNTINGTON: Oh, okay.

13

14 MR. REAKOFF: ....what I felt should be covered there.

15

16

17 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any more questions on this before we  
 move on? (Pause) Hearing none, we'll go on to the next item.

19

20 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. The next item is new business,  
 Mr. Chairman, and under new business there's a section there  
 22 for each agency, if they so desire, to give a report. So I'll  
 23 just go down the list and see if any of the agencies want to  
 24 give a brief report that they want to inform the council about.

25

26 I'll just ask if BLM management has anything they want  
 27 report on to the council that they haven't done already.

28

29 MR. DENTON: I'll have a real brief report, and I've  
 also -- I've kind of covered this a little bit before. But of  
 31 significance, at least in Anchorage District BLM, the State has  
 made a bunch of priorities on their selections for retention  
 and relinquishment. Their lowest priorities are being  
 34 relinquished back to BLM, so those lands will now be coming  
 back into the -- under the subsistence regulations from the  
 36 selected lands that are in Anchorage District, and to date over  
 the last two months there's been close to a million-and-a-half  
 38 acres relinquished back. So we're talking several significant  
 patches of land. Most of it has been so far in your region and  
 40's mostly concentrated in the Big River/Farewell area that  
 we've had several relinquishments back of some of the folks in  
 42 McGrath interest, and there's been a few townships north of  
 43 Swift River in the Aniak(ph) Village area, as well. Those are  
 the ones that are currently of interest to this particular  
 45 region.

46

47 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any questions for Jeff? (Pause)  
 Thank you, Jeff.

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

1 MR. MATHEWS: The next agency would be Fish and  
Wildlife Service, if some of the refuge staff or other staff  
would like to....(pause)

4  
5 MR. ELEY: My name is Tom Eley and I'm the refuge  
manager, relatively new actually as the refuge manager, having  
been in Galena since the first of May.

8  
9 We're real sorry we didn't get to meet with you in  
M0Grath a few months ago, but the weather, as you all probably  
remember, was sort of stinko, so we didn't -- weren't able to  
make it down.

13  
14 The refuge complex looks forward to working with the  
regional council here. There will certainly be people from my  
staff, probably myself, at most of your regional council  
meetings. If you have proposals that affect refuge areas,  
we'll certainly try to have a biologist from the particular  
refuge there to answer any questions you might have to bring  
you up to date on the information that we have and answer any  
questions you may have.

22  
23 I really hope, as I mentioned earlier and as  
M4. Collins and I spoke about at lunchtime today, that you will  
use us as a resource. That's part of the job, in the way I  
view it, is to help you all. We're certainly in contact with  
the federal subsistence people, with Conrad and George Sherrod  
and those people. But I think if I was in your spot, I'd like  
to see the real guys that are doing it every once in awhile in  
case I had specific question, and if any of you ever have  
specific questions of us, please give us a call. We'd be glad  
to talk with you. Harold is our neighbor downriver there and  
try to maintain close contact with him, and Pollock upriver, of  
course. Jack way up river.

35  
36 But if you do have any questions -- speaking for the  
other two refuge managers that are not here, Tom Early from  
Venetie. He's back in Georgia, I believe, for some sort of  
training. He sends his regards and has the same sentiments as  
I do. The same for Ed Merritt who's down in Tucson for some  
sort of training. We're here. We want to work with you.  
We're one of your neighbors, and I hope you'll view us as your  
resources when you need information or have questions.

44  
45 MR. HUNTINGTON: So if we have any idea to come up with  
some proposals, we can probably get some information off of  
you, huh?

48  
49 MR. ELEY: Absolutely.  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay.

3  
4 MR. ELEY: I think that would be the place to start.  
We'll tell you what we know and have any ideas. Stan Ned has  
6 contacted us with some ideas. We're going to work on some  
7 issues related to the Nowitna Refuse and moose. We're going to  
8 work with the folks in Tanana and from Ruby, and hopefully we  
9 can head off issues before they become real issues and/or  
10 problems, and we want to have local people involved and let  
11 them know what we're doing and so forth.

12  
13 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any questions for Tom? (Pause) Thank  
14 you, Tom.

15  
16 MR. MATHEWS: The next agency, I don't see Tim here but  
17 just to make sure I don't miss them, would be Alaska Department  
18 of Fish & Game. I don't see him. The last federal agency  
19 would be National Park Service if they would like to report on  
20 something that they feel the council needs to know at this  
21 time, they have the option.

22  
23 MR. TWITCHELL: Denali Subsistence Resource Commission  
24 met last Friday and dealt with a quite large range of issues.  
25 Only one of them has pertinence with the Western Interior  
26 Advisory Council, and that was their position that they took on  
27 the -- extending federal jurisdiction to selected lands, and  
28 we've already discussed that earlier in the meeting, and a  
29 letter from the commission regarding their position will be CC-  
30 mailed to the Chair, so he'll have received that.

31  
32 There were not any -- we'll be receiving that letter.

33  
34 There were not any proposals in the federal changes to  
35 the seasons and bag limits that affected lands within the  
36 western interior region. So there was no action on Denali SRC  
37 on that. They did take a number of actions on other proposals  
38 that involved areas in the eastern interior and south central.  
39 But since they're not involved with this region, I won't  
40 elaborate on those at this point.

41  
42 So I have nothing further beyond that to report.

43  
44 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any questions for Hollis? (Pause)  
45 Thanks, Hollis.

46  
47 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, this would be an  
48 opportunity for any of the private organizations to comment,  
49 which would include Native corporations, non-profits, et  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

etetera, if they have -- oh, I'm sorry. Steve does have something. I'm sorry. The next one will be privates. Sorry.

3

4 MR. ULVI: Vince, Mr. Chairman, just a couple things quickly. I know in particular for people who live down in the lower river and away from park areas, it's hard to understand what the heck the differences are between park management policies and refuge management policies and things like that, and I certainly don't plan to get into those things here now, but I'd like to just tell you about a couple of things we're doing that have to do with subsistence, and hopefully it will help you better understand what we're about.

13

14 This -- the one thing that we talked about earlier was the regional council appointments to our Subsistence Resource Commission. The charters are being changed. We've requested that the Secretary of the Interior change our Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission. We had a meeting in late January. They sent out letter to the Secretary asking him to do that. The end result will be that for Gates of the Arctic and the Central Brooks Range, we have three Federal regional councils. You're one, the Northwest Arctic is one, and the North Slope is the other. Now each of those councils will be able to appoint one member to the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission. So it's nice and balanced and even, fairly represents the cultures and the user groups, and it's just a good solution, and I appreciate your comments in previous meetings and your support of that because I think it's a win/win deal for everybody involved and it's just the right way to do things.

31

32 The second thing is that we, along with a number of other agencies, State and Federal and Native corporations and non-profit groups primarily in Fairbanks, have been working on a summer youth camp that we're going to try to conduct for the first time at Chena Hot Springs this June, from June 5th to June 15th. It's a pilot year, first time ever, so we're taking a kind of slow. But it's for high school aged youth from Northern Alaska. We're targeting primarily rural communities, and they will have to be nominated and apply. A very small fee.

42

43 We'll take them for ten days and go through a resource management learning module, mostly in the field, hands-on, so that any kids that have any interest whatsoever in field biology, resource management, what the Native groups and agencies are doing in the way of managing resources particularly on public lands, they'll have a chance to be exposed to a wide variety of those things, such as wildlife

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

management, fisheries, aquatic resources, fire and forestry, and go through problem solving type exercises, which we often do. So it's kind of a chance for them to understand better what some of us do in our careers and our livelihood and hoping, of course -- the big hope is that young folks from these communities will get turned on to some of those ideas and end up going on to college and end up coming back to work for the Park Service or Federal or State agencies or Native groups and help us with this complicated task of resource management and subsistence.

11

12 So you will be in most all of your villages, I think, the schools of -- perhaps not down as far as Aniak, but the schools will be getting these brochures and flyers in the next couple of weeks so that we can try to keep this thing going. It's called Earth Quest, Alaska Wildlife and Wildlands Exploration Camp.

18

19 The third thing real quick is the Anaktuvuk Pass land exchange. Legislation was passed by the House unanimously a month or so ago and is now in Murkowski's committee in the Senate. They expect to pass it into law in the next couple of weeks or so. So finally, after ten years of negotiations between the Park Service and the Nunamiut at Anaktuvuk Pass, it looks as though that legislation will go through and the wilderness and park boundaries around Anaktuvuk Pass will be redrawn and changed. Essentially what it boils down to is they will be able to go ahead and use their ARGO's and ATV's to access caribou in the summer because those lands will be open to them or become their own lands, and we'll back off -- back the boundaries off a little bit, and hopefully they can get on doing things the way they need to and have enough room to breathe there, and then we can get back to park and wilderness management at a greater distance from the community there.

35

36 So again, I think it's a win/win deal, and everybody's hoping that Murkowski's committee will pass that, and you'll be hearing more about that because afterwards it's going to require a cooperative management plan between the Nunamiut and the Park Service which has, to my knowledge, never been done anywhere before, where we will all have to work together from the beginning all the way through for their uses on 426,000 acres of park land as far as impacts and as far as all these kinds of things. So you'll hear more about it.

45

46 And one of the other things we're involved with is the North Slope Borough has decided to hire harvest monitors in each of their communities on the North Slope full-time to attempt to record harvest of all species by people in those

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

communities, and they will be attempting to identify in rough terms numbers and where those species come from. In other words, were they coming off of State land, Native land, or Federal land or whatever. Try to build a data base from which they feel -- based on their experience with marine mammals and whales in particular, they feel they want that scientific data to protect their subsistence opportunity into the future. So they're putting their money where their mouth is and they're moving forward on this. We're very happy to see that and are cooperating with them for Nuwiksik and Anaktuvuk, which are two of our communities on the North Slope.

12

13 And I personally hope that we hear more about these same sorts of harvest tracking/harvest monitoring plans by other corporations and villages and Native groups, 'cause I think -- we feel that it's very important for resource protection and continued opportunity.

18

19 And the last thing is our Subsistence Resource Commission did meet in late January. Jack and Pollock here on our council are also on that commission, and among all the other business they did in two-and-a-half days, they have a Hunting Plan Recommendation Number 11 going out now to the public and the Chair here, and Vince will be receiving a copy of that, as well as 105 other addresses or something, for public comment, all the villages affected. And basically what they've done is they've gone ahead and said, "We think the Federal customary and traditional use determination process is way too slow, way too bureaucratic, way too complicated; we want to step forward and say that for most of the species, whether it be trees, plants, fish, birds, or wildlife, most of the species that you find in the Gates of the Arctic region have been customary and traditionally used by the people who live in these communities and these villages." And they've pushed that to the Secretary to see whether or not he buys into that or not.

37

38 So it's, I think, kind of a straightforward and elegant way to see if there might be another alternative to this long QOT process. It doesn't address non-park lands or anything like that, but that will be circulated around. You folks and the Chair here in this council have an opportunity to comment on that. It'd be a sixty-day comment period, so you'll be seeing it. So perhaps you can choose to circulate it to the other members or however you want, and the Secretary of the Interior will decide on the appropriateness of that concept.

47

48 And that's all I have.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman?

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes, Herman?

4

5 MR. MORGAN: I have a question or a comment to all  
6 these people who gave their reports. You know, you all know by  
7 now that we're having a problem with wolves, and we're having  
8 our meeting in October, and if any of you guys can come up with  
9 any solutions or find ways to help the subsistence user, we'd  
10 be glad to hear about it by this fall. And that's my comment.

11

12 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you. Any more questions?

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: I didn't know if some of the private  
15 organizations or individuals wanted to speak. I know there's a  
16 representative of Tanana Chiefs here. There may be other  
17 representatives. They have the option to comment, if they  
18 would like.

19

20 MR. NED: (Inaudible - away from microphone) Well, I  
21 really don't have much on there. We're doing a study on eleven  
22 of our villages right now as far as large mammals go: moose,  
23 caribou, wolf, brown bear and black bear. And we're on our  
24 third year -- on our final year, and everything's looking  
25 pretty good so far, and we want to continue doing that and  
26 doing it cooperatively with you at Fish & Wildlife or with the  
27 State, whichever want to work with us, if we could come up with  
28 some kind of money to do that. And that's about all I have. I  
29 don't have much. We'd like to see that continue.

30

31 MR. MORGAN: I have a question for you. Are you doing  
32 any studies on wolves?

33

34 MR. NED: No. We'd really like to see some kind of  
35 study on the wolves.

36

37 MR. MORGAN: Is it too late to include that in your  
38 studies?

39

40 MR. NED: No, not yet. Oh, it's too late for this  
41 year. Yes, it is, but we can -- what you guys can do is  
42 request that a study be done on the wolves in your area. You  
43 can come up with a proposal.

44

45 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. Maybe the Chairman can.

46

47 MR. HUNTINGTON: Stan, I have a question for you. Is  
48 Tanana Chiefs doing any study on tribal management of the fish  
49 and wildlife?

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



1  
2 MR. NED: Say that again?  
3  
4 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is Tanana Chiefs doing any study on  
5 the tribal management of fish and wildlife resources?  
6  
7 MR. NED: No.  
8  
9 MR. HUNTINGTON: No? Because it's something that's  
10 going to be coming up within the next six months to a year.  
11 Different councils are discussing it and I think....  
12  
13 MR. NED: I believe they are working on that at the  
14 administrative level at TCC.  
15  
16 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. Thanks. Any other questions or  
17 comments from the different agencies? (Pause) If not, we'll  
18 go down to the next thing on the agenda.  
19  
20 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the next item, Gloria will  
21 give you an update on, but essentially it's dealing with  
22 regional council member nominations. So if there's any council  
23 members here or public that would like to nominate themselves  
24 to be -- to fill the three seats that will be open on this  
25 council, we have applications here and the application period  
26 closes on February 28th. Gloria's the one that receives all  
27 those applications, so maybe she has something else to share on  
28 those applications. Not the people, but what has happened  
29 with.... (pause)  
30  
31 MS. MASCHMEYER: Yeah. We're further ahead in the  
32 process this year and hopefully we'll stay on schedule so that  
33 we get your regional council members appointed by the  
34 secretary, you know, long before your fall meetings take place,  
35 and our apology is for what's happened in the past. But the  
36 application period this year is ending on February 28th, and  
37 all of you should have gotten a little packet here explaining  
38 the nomination process, and as Vince says, we have some more of  
39 them here.  
40  
41 The way the regional councils are set up is that one-  
42 third of the seats roll over each year. So this year there are  
43 seats that are available throughout the ten regional  
44 councils. Three are rolling over on your council. If you  
45 would like to reapply for your seat, you do have to do exactly  
46 that, and that is to reapply. So if you are holding a seat and  
47 you haven't turned in a new application, please do that.  
48  
49 Also, the applications aren't just targeted to people  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Who want to apply themselves, but they're also -- you may nominate someone. So possibly there's someone from your community that you would like to encourage to be on the council, and that would be good to make those nominations as well.

6

7 To date we've had a lot of nominations come in for Regions 1 and 2, being south central and southeast, because those are, you know, the larger populated areas. To date I believe when I left the office yesterday or the day before, that we had about 75 applicants. Now, that's not just for your region, but in total, and I don't recall -- at last count I hadn't gotten them out into the different regions to recount how many there were.

15

16 But just to let you know that, you know, the process then from the close-off date of the 28th, then there will be a review in mid-March by the interagency staff committee appointees. What that means is that all of the agencies - the five agencies that make up your Federal Subsistence Board, their staff committee representative - is appointing people from those different areas of land management to review the applications and to make recommendations to the board for appointments to those seats, and then the board will take that up, and that would hopefully -- we're planning for the April meeting, and then it goes from the board to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture for appointment.

28

29 Jack?

30

31 MR. REAKOFF: My seat expires in 1996. If I wanted to reapply, would I have to reapply by this upcoming February 28th?

34

35 MR. MATHEWS: No. No. It's just the '95 seats are up....

37

38 MR. REAKOFF: Oh.

39

40 MR. MATHEWS: ....which are listed under Tab 1.

41

42 MS. MASCHMEYER: So they expire in '95? Your seat would expire in '96.

44

45 MR. REAKOFF: All right. But I would have to apply by next February.

47

48 MR. MASCHMEYER: Yes. Yes.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. MATHEWS: The three seats that are open are seats  
2, 5, and 6, which are now held by Henry Deacon, Philip Graham,  
and Sharon Strick. And, of course, if during the process of  
the year someone has to resign for whatever reason, we go to  
that pool of applicants to pull from, and I think Gloria will  
validate this: We will provide you with a list of all the  
people that have applied for your region, but will mail it to  
you individually just so you're aware that you have X  
individuals that have applied for or been nominated.

10

11 MR. HUNTINGTON: (Nods head)

12

13 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. We can go on to the next item,  
which is comments on residency requirements, so I would really  
encourage you to turn to Tab number 10, 'cause this is in  
general a fairly easy subject, but then when we start -- and  
Jack can reaffirm this. When you start defining singular  
words, it gets interesting.

19

20 Okay. What is happening, is you'll see in Tab 10 --  
I'll just kind of read it, but the problem is what you need to  
focus on on page 1, and that's residency and license  
requirements for participating in the federal subsistence  
hunts.

25

26 Okay. The definition of residence is somewhat general  
and it does not specify a length of residency in a location.  
This creates situations where someone can claim residency in a  
community even if they maintain a household in another part of  
the state or even out of state. There's two areas where this  
needs to be addressed. One is residency and the other is in  
the wording concerning requiring the pertinent license,  
combined with the above resident problem, could allow -- well,  
you can read it. "Allows a person to locate to a rural  
community even from outside the state and establish a  
residence, obtain a non-resident hunting license, and qualify  
for a federal subsistence hunt." And the background just gives  
you an idea that the definition of resident comes from Section  
49 which is, "Any person who has as his primary, permanent home  
within Alaska and whenever absent from this primary, permanent  
home, has the intention of returning to it." And you'll see  
the factors listed underneath there that address that.

43

44 Then under licenses, is where the -- section 6, is  
where the word pertinent comes up, and that says, "Licenses,  
permits, harvest tag, tickets, tags, and reports of the  
regulations requires subsistence users to possess the  
pertinent, valid state hunting, fishing, and trapping licenses  
unless federal licenses are required."

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 Then there's a -- well, there's a paragraph about the  
3 importance of licenses, and what you really need to focus on is  
4 the next paragraph, which was approved by the board, that the  
5 board believes it was not the intent of Congress to provide an  
6 immediate subsistence priority for newly-settled persons who  
7 have no or minimal history of customary traditional use of  
8 subsistence resources.

9  
10 So the board would like you to comment on three  
11 options. Option A is just do not revise the federal  
12 subsistence management regulations at this time, which means  
13 that someone could qualify being an outside and et cetera.  
14 Option B would be make regulatory changes to clarify the  
15 board's intent as suggested, and they're suggesting that the  
16 wording -- well, you can see it up there. It's the underlined  
17 wording. Under Section 6, that -- for subsistence hunting on  
18 federal lands, the State residence hunting license is required.  
19 A State resident -- oh, you don't -- yes, you do. A State  
20 resident hunting license requires twelve months within the  
21 state, and hopefully my fellow teammates will make sure I don't  
22 miss something here.

23  
24 Okay. The other thing is for subsistence trapping on  
25 federal lands, a State resident trapping license is required,  
26 and for subsistence fishing on federally administered waters,  
27 a license is required. The term "residence" would refer to  
28 individuals who have lived in a location long enough to  
29 establish and maintain a residency at that location,  
30 parentheses, nine months at a location and twelve months within  
31 the state.

32  
33 Option C is to revise the regulations to eliminate the  
34 need for any license for harvesting subsistence resources on  
35 federal lands. This option could result in widespread abuse by  
36 non-qualified individuals competing with rural residents for  
37 limited resources, especially in more easily accessible areas.  
38 But it would impose less paperwork burden on rural residents.

39  
40 So that's the issue of residency requirement that the  
41 board is asking you to comment on. If there's any questions --  
42 know that following this you have copies of a letter from the  
43 joint -- I thought it was a joint board. Well, actually it's  
44 from -- yes, it is from the joint board, the joint boards of  
45 fisheries and Game from the State, and you have a letter from  
46 Bureau of Land Management expressing their concerns about this  
47 resident thing here, and we do have two staff from Bureau of  
48 Land Management that I think will help you if there's some  
49 other additional questions. So you need to comment on these  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Options on dealing with residency requirements.

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: (Pause) Any questions or comments on  
this?

5

6 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

7

8 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, Jack?

9

10 MR. REAKOFF: I think it's a very clear-cut issue.  
Option B requiring a state hunting license is the preferred  
alternative. A rural resident has long been standing as the  
twelve consecutive months, and resident is twelve consecutive  
months, and all of the ANILCA law talks about rural residents,  
it's been traditional in Alaska to consider a resident as no  
more under twelve months of residency. So I feel that this  
is -- Option B is the preferred one.

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I should point out that  
those are just possible options. You could also come up with  
your own if you so desire. I just want to make sure I didn't  
make you believe you were limited to these three options, but  
they pretty much cover the full range.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman? Yeah. I would lean  
towards B, too, because it seems to address most of these --  
and this one doesn't specify that you have to be in a rural  
area for twelve months, I think, as long as you have the  
resident license? Because I can see people moving back to the  
community for outside but have been in the State, let's say,  
and they may want to subsistence hunt that fall. Under this  
option, I guess they could if they had a State license, or not?  
Is....(pause)

34

35 MR. COFFING: I'm looking at the last paragraph,  
Mr. Chairman, in Option B.

37

38 MR. COLLINS: In that location, nine months. Oh.

39

40 MR. COFFING: There it says that they could be there  
nine months under this -- ....

42

43 MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay.

44

45 MR. COFFING: ....under the way this option is laid  
out. But I -- I think the council should feel free to, you  
know, not feel locked in by nine months or twelve months, but  
feel free to discuss it amongst yourselves what it is you think  
you want to do.

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. HUNTINGTON: I think it should be amended on this  
3 last paragraph. I think we can come up with maybe a length of  
4 time. Instead of nine months and twelve months, I think it  
5 should be open for discussion, either that or just strike this  
6 off the option.

7  
8 MR. MATHEWS: Your first suggestion was to change it to  
9 twelve months at the location?

10  
11 MR. HUNTINGTON: Um-hum (affirmative).

12  
13 MR. MATHEWS: Or your second one is just to put in  
14 there twelve months within the State?

15  
16 MR. COLLINS: Well, I can see problems. I see -- in  
17 the Cantwell area, one of the criticisms they had on that since  
18 was a resident community is you had a State trooper move in,  
19 think, and he was immediately eligible for subsistence  
20 hunting in the Denali Park because he was a resident of  
21 Cantwell, and that caused kind of a stir. So just being a  
22 resident of the State -- the ones I was thinking of is --  
23 because of mobility, people go away to work and then they come  
24 back in Anchorage. Maybe someone who has previously  
25 established residency in that community or something or  
26 turning something like -- it has -- might fit that. That's  
27 the ones that would get caught, because I know people that have  
28 retired, like, in the summer in our area and moved back there  
29 the fall, they wouldn't want to wait a year before they  
30 could subsistence hunt.

31  
32 MR. REAKOFF: The other facet is a lot of people go  
33 firefighting or fishing or doing something in the summer that  
34 takes them away from their primary residence for summer work,  
35 and if they were required to stay there twelve months, that  
36 would exclude them from going to firefighting or anything else.  
37 I think that a location -- that it should be a rural location,  
38 the word inserted "rural," as in -- you know, there's rural and  
39 non-rural areas.

40  
41 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: At a rural location?

42  
43 MR. REAKOFF: Yes. Nine months at a rural location,  
44 which would be -- the primary residence would be a rural  
45 residence.

46  
47 MR. HUNTINGTON: Um-hum. Any more questions? Is there  
48 motion for Option B for the amendments? (Pause) Does this  
49 have to be discussed now or do we have to have some kind of  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

action now or....(pause)

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, because I believe it's going to be  
before the board at the upcoming meeting. I'm not sure. Does  
Jeff or Dave know? I mean, this is an issue that's come up on  
BLM lands and other lands, but in particular, that's why the  
letter was attached. I didn't see any agenda for the upcoming  
meeting, but I thought it was this spring that it's going to  
be. If not, it's going to be brought up probably before you  
meet again, so I think it'd be safe that you need -- the best  
thing would be to take action today, and that way it would be  
before the board in April, and if they meet during the summer  
on this issue, it -- your situation is there. So it doesn't  
require you to take action, but they're asking you to comment  
on these options or come up with your own or amend them.

16

17 MR. HUNTINGTON: Take into consideration the State  
residency require thirty days?

19

20 MR. MATHEWS: This is trying to make sure that the  
Federal system matches the State residency requirement.

22

23 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, the State....

24

25 MR. MATHEWS: And I wasn't here when the program  
started, but there was a lot of discussion when this program  
started about this, and I just was not privy with that, why  
they didn't in the beginning go with that, and I'm not sure if  
anybody here can shed any more light or not. But this....

30

31 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, if I'm correct, you qualify for  
residency, you know, if you live in a community for  
thirty days. You're automatically a resident under State....

34

35 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, you mean under State?

36

37 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. Under municipal law it is,  
Alaska Statute 29.

39

40 MR. COFFING: Thirty days for voting, I think, is the  
requirement, isn't it?

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: But to get a State hunting license, you  
have to be there twelve months. For the other requirements for  
other government programs, they may vary. I'm not up to speed  
on thirty days or sixty days for other ones, but for a State  
hunting license, you have to prove you're a residence for  
twelve months within that area -- within the State. Excuse me.  
Not the area. Within the State.

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, I think Vince said it  
3 right. You have to -- to qualify as a State resident and get a  
4 State resident hunting, fishing, and trapping license, you have  
5 to have resided in the State immediate preceding twelve  
6 consecutive months. So that's what it comes down to. It may  
7 be different for Permanent Fund Dividend and that sort of  
8 thing, but for hunting license it is.

9  
10 One of the problems that this tends to address is that  
11 a person who is a non-resident who would come to Alaska but  
12 would end up in a rural community might qualify. I'm going to  
13 pick Glennallen, as an example. Might qualify for a Nelchina  
14 permit when he's only lived in the State for five days. He  
15 would qualify for the Federal subsistence permit, and that is  
16 viewed by some people as not fair to people who have lived  
17 there a long time and maybe didn't get a permit. So this  
18 effort is to first require that a person is a State resident  
19 and has been here the preceding twelve consecutive months, one,  
20 and the other one would be that for a permit in a particular  
21 area, as one possibility here, is that he's lived in that  
22 community for nine months.

23  
24 MR. MATHEWS: So was there a second to that motion to  
25 insert "rural"? I'm not sure if there ever was a second.

26  
27 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: I'll second it.

28  
29 MR. HUNTINGTON: That's for Option B?

30  
31 MR. MATHEWS: And I believe it was to insert  
32 nine months at a rural location and twelve months within the  
33 State," within that parentheses on page 3.

34  
35 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: I think just previous to the  
36 parenthesis it says "enough to establish and maintain residency  
37 at that location," and between the word "that" and "location,"  
38 would insert "rural."

39  
40 MR. MATHEWS: Oh. So it'd be twice in it?

41  
42 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Would that be -- is that what you  
43 want?

44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Thank you.

46  
47 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. It's been moved and seconded  
48 adopt Option B with the changes.

49  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



1 MR. COLLINS: That still requires nine months there  
 Before they'd become a resident of that rural community again,  
 and that could be a problem for some. I mean, they may be a  
 resident of the State, but if they move back, they've got to  
 stay in their own community for another nine months before they  
 could again become a rural resident for subsistence, moving  
 back and forth. Is there a way of saying "or have previously  
 established residence in that community," or something like  
 that? I'm thinking of return is -- it's clear that they have  
 to be in the State for a year to get the resident license, and  
 that catches most of it, but you still have the problem of  
 people that do move back and forth, maybe working away or may  
 have been in the Service or who knows what. Returns, might  
 qualify, but he'd have to live there nine months before he  
 could become a subsistence user, and that's his home.

16

17 MR. HUNTINGTON: I'd like to see it more like  
 six months, really. Being more flexible if you move around.

19

20 MR. COLLINS: Well, if you just say that, though, then  
 you have other new residents in the State that just move out  
 there. If you just make it short, then you've got residents of  
 Anchorage that could move in, and as soon as they meet that  
 three months or whatever, they become a resident there, and  
 that's what some people react to, that they're not a -- that'd  
 be kind of quick.

27

28 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. Most people will move into rural  
 areas for the summer to take summer jobs or something. They  
 might come in May, so they're going to be there. Even within a  
 five-month period, they could qualify to hunt in the  
 fall hunts. See? You've got to be careful about making it too  
 short.

34

35 MR. HUNTINGTON: I think six months, you know, is a  
 pretty good idea 'cause if you stay six months or more, you  
 know, you pretty much know whether you're going to stay or not.

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

40

41 MR. HUNTINGTON: What does the rest of the board  
 members feel on this time limit?

43

44 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman? I think something should be  
 there like what he said, for somebody who lived there before  
 and come back, you know, they should be allowed to hunt, you  
 know, since they live there and everything and they shouldn't  
 be excluded. I think something should be in there to that  
 effect.

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

1  
2 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. I agree with you on that.  
3

4 MR. COLLINS: That work or who have previously  
5 established residence in said community? They'd still have to  
6 meet the State re- -- anybody in the State can do it by living  
7 there nine months, but those who have previously established  
8 residency in the community could do it immediately if they  
9 met -- if they're eligible for a State hunting license.  
10

11 MR. HUNTINGTON: I think that's a good idea.  
12

13 MR. COFFING: So under that scenario, a person that  
14 lived in any community ten years and then moved Outside for  
15 thirty years, came back for twelve months would qualify. But  
16 someone that lived -- that stayed in Alaska all their life but  
17 moved from a rural community to a new rural community and only  
18 lived there three months wouldn't qualify.  
19

20 MR. COLLINS: That's right. You do have people moving  
21 between rural communities.  
22

23 MR. COFFING: It's a difficult one to....(pause)  
24

25 MR. COLLINS: And you have people moving from urban to  
26 rural.  
27

28 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, I don't want to spend too much  
29 time on this 'cause we have other things to get into, so let's  
30 come on up with some solution and move on. Any other  
31 suggestions?  
32

33 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, you do have a motion  
34 on the floor, so -- it's been seconded. Something has to be  
35 done with that.  
36

37 MR. COLLINS: It's for the rural or the -- oh, to  
38 support....  
39

40 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. Rural is the motion on the floor  
41 on the last paragraph.  
42

43 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, I guess we're ready for a vote  
44 then. Questions?  
45

46 MR. GRAHAM: Let me clarify. We're -- the motion is to  
47 take Option B and insert "rural" in there? Is that what  
48 we're....  
49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. I'll read it. It would insert  
 2 "rural" in the last paragraph of B. "The term residents will  
 3 refer to individuals who have lived in a rural location long  
 4 enough to establish and maintain a residency at that location,"  
 5 parentheses, "nine months at a rural location and twelve months  
 6 within the State," close parentheses. That's the motion that's  
 7 on the floor. It's two part: One to support B and amend it  
 8 with -- I think that's what it is.

9  
 10 UNIDENTIFIED: I think they'll do two motions.

11  
 12 MR. MATHEWS: Oh. They'll do two motions. I'm sorry.  
 13 So it's to amend it, and then you'll have to take another  
 14 motion to adopt B as amended.

15  
 16 MR. HUNTINGTON: I think it's just one motion with the  
 17 amendments.

18  
 19 MR. MATHEWS: Well....(pause)

20  
 21 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. We're ready for a vote. All in  
 22 favor of the motion to adopt Option B with amendments, signify  
 23 by saying aye.

24  
 25 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

26  
 27 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
 28 Motion carries. Option B with amendment is adopted.

29  
 30 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I assume we're moving on to the  
 31 next agenda item, which would be finally to the main reason for  
 32 this meeting, and that is to look at Federal regulations. I do  
 33 have a handout -- proposals to change Federal regulations.  
 34 Excuse me. I have a handout that may help us with that, so  
 35 I'll pass it around. Mr. Chairman, you have -- and Council,  
 36 you hopefully have one of these red-covered books that list the  
 37 proposals for your region directly. What's being handed out to  
 38 you is showing you that there are other proposals, either  
 39 because of their C&T determination -- well, yeah, because of  
 40 their C&T determination, you may want to look at. So I'm going  
 41 to ask for your advice on that of how to proceed. What I would  
 42 suggest for time is two options: One, we immediately go to the  
 43 proposals that are directly tied to your area and then go back  
 44 to those that may be tied by no determinations or by  
 45 surrounding regions; or we go to those that have no  
 46 determinations and surrounding ones and get those out of the  
 47 way.

48  
 49 If you look at the chart I've passed out, you'll see a  
 50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

Whole bunch of them that say "no determinations" for various regions across the State. You can have me bring them up and vote them down or just say all those that are not within your region such-and-such, you don't want to carry, you don't want to comment on. So give me direction and your staff will respond in kind.

7

8 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, if there's no comment from the rest of the board, I'd like to just deal with the proposals that affect this western interior area.

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. With your sheet -- I have to look at someone else's. What I did with that chart that will make it easier for us to track is I asterisked the ones that have direct ties to your region and have direct tie to your region by associate C&T's. So maybe we could just go down those, if you wouldn't mind, which would be -- we would start with Proposal 38, go to 39, 40, 51, 62, 64, and 65, and then any of the other ones are open for you to comment on if there's no determination. Is that agreeable? Okay.

21

22 Proposal 38 is in your red book here. But Proposal 38 has a letter that accompanies it that I would like to present to you that was sent, and I have to find my copy quick. It's under Tab 11, I think. Yes, it is. Proposal 38 was submitted by Kwethluk IRA Council, and in submitting it, reviewing it, they discovered that their original proposal was different than what they really intended to do. So they sent this letter following direction from the Federal Subsistence Office, this letter to me in care of you, that -- in reference to Proposal 38, that they would like you to take the completely revised one, which is attached to that letter and not the one that's in the proposal book. So -- and for the public, I'll give them to Gloria if you're trying to track along, we have a florescent yellow one that you can keep yourself awake with that shows the proposal that Kwethluk to have in the book. So the -- I think the cleanest way for them now to do is to decide to -- for the Council is to accept the letter and its attached proposal as the proposal for 38.

40

41 MR. HUNTINGTON: Excuse me, Vince, but I think the kids are just about completing their ski meet. Can we take a ten-minute break?

44

45 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, sure. That'd be fine.

46

47 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. Ten-minute break.

48

49 (Off record)

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 (On record)

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: We'll call the meeting back to order.  
4 Can everybody take their seats so we can get started? (Pause)  
5 Getting back to Federal regulation proposals. Vince?

6

7 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, we left off on  
8 Proposal 38, and what's in your red book is a proposal that was  
9 submitted originally, but the submitters realized that that  
10 proposal didn't reflect their original intent, so they wrote  
11 you a letter which is under Tab 11 and attached that letter as  
12 the proposal that they would like to have you address and not  
13 the one in the red book. So I'll leave to Mike on this 'cause  
14 Mike and Conrad are -- Conrad will give you the biological  
15 assessment and et cetera. But is it clear to everyone that  
16 before you now is Proposal 38 that's as-written in the red  
17 book, and you need to decide if you want to go with this  
18 revised one.

19

20 Mike can tell you the differences between the two, if  
21 that would help.

22

23 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to do that.  
24 Do you want me to continue? I think what I'm going to point to  
25 what is in your booklet. You're going to see -- following  
26 the letter from Kwethluk is the proposal that they intended for  
27 you to look at here and that they intended to submit. The  
28 first part of it shows you what the seasons are now, and so  
29 essentially what they're proposing is what you see beginning at  
30 the bottom of the page and continuing on the second page, and  
31 essentially what they are requesting is for the bag limit to be  
32 increased from four caribou to five for Unit 19(A) south of the  
33 Kuskokwim. That currently is what the State bag limit is; it  
34 is five caribou. There's a bit of a difference in this bag  
35 limit, though, and the State's bag limit. Although the number  
36 is five under both what Kwethluk and what the State has,  
37 currently under the State regulations, the bag limit is five.  
38 However, no more than two may be bulls under the current State  
39 regulations. This regulation would essentially make it  
40 five caribou of either sex, five bulls or five cows or  
41 combination thereof.

42

43 The other thing that the proposal does is it changes  
44 the season dates for Unit 19(A) and (B) south of the Kuskokwim  
45 river, and the season dates that are being proposed are more  
46 liberal, and those season dates would also match the State  
47 season dates. So currently the Federal caribou hunting dates  
48 for Unit 19(A) and (B) are more restrictive than the State  
49 season dates, and this proposal would make the season dates

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

exactly the same. So there would be consistency between openings and closings of caribou hunting in 19(A) and (B).

3  
4 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chairman?

5  
6 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes, Conrad?

7  
8 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, these two proposals were --  
9 Let me explain why the write-up for the original proposal  
10 that's in your book -- even though there was a letter that came  
11 in that would have changed that, the original proposal that  
12 came in that the analysis is done for in your book had already  
13 started into the public process and had been printed prior to  
14 their realizing that a mistake had been made. The letter came  
15 in after the process was in place, and there was a  
16 determination made in our subsistence office that it would be  
17 inappropriate to change that proposal since it had gone out to  
18 the public as it is and that the proposal needed to be dealt  
19 with as a modification by the councils at this point.

20  
21 I have an analysis for proposal both -- both of the  
22 ways it's written. It's done -- it's really a completely  
23 different proposal that way that it's been modified, the  
24 proposal that you have, and so you really need to take an  
25 action on going with either a modification or the original  
26 proposal, or I'm going to have to make presentations on two  
27 really very different proposals. They're different areas  
28 completely.

29  
30 MR. COLLINS: How do we identify this? The substitute  
31 proposal or what? In a motion what would we -- so that we know  
32 we're referring to the one that's in our book and not that.

33  
34  
35 MR. MATHEWS: The cleanest way to do it would be to  
36 substitute the proposal submitted by the Kwethluk such-and-such  
37 date as the Proposal Number 38, and then I suppose we could  
38 just -- yeah. We'll just -- well, we'll have that motion in  
39 the record and then we'll have to carry it forth that way, and  
40 Delta has not met yet. Their meeting's March 1st and 2nd, I  
41 believe.

42  
43 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

44  
45 MR. MATHEWS: So we're under the assumption that they  
46 will adopt this -- they will substitute the proposal, also.

47  
48 MR. COLLINS: I so move, and it would be a motion for  
49 adoption or for approval of -- for substitution and....

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. It'd be a motion to substitute the  
3 proposal in the letter for the one that's listed in the draft  
4 proposal analysis for western region, the red book.

5  
6 MR. HUNTINGTON: There's a motion on the floor to  
7 substitute the proposal from the red book. Is there a second?

8  
9 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Second.

10  
11 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded to adopt  
12 the changes. Any questions? (Pause) All in favor of the  
13 motion, signify by saying aye.

14  
15 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

16  
17 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
18 Motion carries.

19  
20 MR. MATHEWS: So Mr. Chairman, so everyone's clear,  
21 when the proposal that's attached to the letter, and to the  
22 public the yellow one, is the one now that's before us and  
23 needs background information on and et cetera.

24  
25 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, I'm prepared to give the  
26 staff analysis on that proposal at this time, if you'd like.  
27 Just to reiterate what Mike has said already, this proposal is  
28 dealing with Units 19(A) south of the Kuskokwim River and  
29 Units 19(B). It would change the bag limit from four to  
30 five caribou and it would change the season dates from  
31 August 10th to March 31, to August 1 through April 15th.

32  
33 This modification to change the Federal Subsistence  
34 Regulations would align season dates with the existing State season  
35 dates in those two areas, and it would align bag limits with  
36 the exception that the State regulations provide for  
37 five caribou, but only two of those five may be two bull  
38 caribou.

39  
40 We're dealing with actually potentially three different  
41 caribou herds in Units 19(A) south of the Kuskokwim and  
42 Unit 19(B). The major caribou herd that we're dealing with is  
43 the Mulchatna caribou herd. The Mulchatna caribou herd is a  
44 large, still-growing herd, well over 100,000 animals. The  
45 other two caribou herds that we're dealing with are the Kilbuck  
46 caribou herd, which occasionally gets into Unit 19(B), just on  
47 the periphery of it, primarily during the winter habitat, and  
48 at that time it would be heavily diluted with a number of  
49 animals from the Mulchatna herd. Also, we'd be dealing with  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

the Rainy Pass caribou herd. Let's see. If you look at the map, the Rainy Pass caribou herd -- is it on this one? In 19(B) is in a very far western -- eastern. I'm sorry. Eastern corner of 19(B) on National Park Service lands, and it just barely gets into 19(B) on some occasions there.

6

7 The Rainy Pass herd is quite a small herd. It's a herd that could not stand additional excessive harvest. The only concern that we have from a biological standpoint for dealing with this proposal is a concern for the Rainy Pass herd. We certainly don't have any concern for the Mulchatna herd. If this proposal would cause a substantial increase in the Rainy Pass herd, this could be detrimental to that herd.

14

15 The one thing that does protect the Rainy Pass herd is 16's far-removed from most locations except Lime Village, and 17 would be unusual, from the information we have, for 18 Lime Village residents probably to go as far as the very 19 eastern edge of 19(B) to hunt caribou because normally the 20 Mulchatna herd is up in the Lime Village area. So probably 21's protected somewhat by location. If you wanted to give 22 that herd additional protection, what could be done is the 23 proposal could be modified to exempt that portion of 24 Park Service land which really only has Rainy Pass animals on 25 at this time, and that way they would be exempted.

26

27 The situation is, though, that the State regulations 28 did not exempt the Rainy Pass herd. They felt that just the 29 isolation of the herd would give it protection. I'm also -- 30 Tim and I were talking earlier, and since Tim Osborne could not 31 be here, he asked me to give the State presentation, also, of 32 their feelings on this. They support this modified proposal, 33 and their comments were with the original proposal, which has 34 been dropped, so Tim and I discussed the proposal that you're 35 looking at now, and they would support this proposal. They 36 also have some concerns about the Rainy Pass herd, but as their 37 regulations do not specifically protect that Rainy Pass herd, 38 they are somewhat viewed on that point.

39

40 I have a lot of information. Let me just check real 41 quick and make sure I have not missed a key point. (Pause) 42 That's basically all I have. Again, we're looking at the 43 Mulchatna herd. It's a very large herd, and there's absolutely 44 no problem with harvesting an additional animal out of that 45 herd.

46

47 If you have any questions, I'll be glad to try to 48 answer them for you. I would also like to make one statement 49 because I'm liable to forget as I go through: This booklet

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



right here, all of this information is the information for the four proposals that I'm presenting to you. Each one of these proposals we spent anywhere from -- I spent just doing biological analysis, anywhere from one day to two weeks working on it. I basically try to go through all of the literature and talk to all of the key players: State and Federal biologists that may be dealing with that area and anyone else that's doing research that would have specific knowledge -- biological-technical knowledge on that particular proposal. So I do have a lot of additional information if you're interested in that. A great deal of this information and all of the harvest data with a few exceptions comes from ADF&G publications or the ADF&G harvest data base. And again, that's true with all of the proposals I'm dealing with.

15

16 If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

17

18 One other thing that I did miss. If you look at the amounts of Federal land in Units 19(A) and 19(B), and again remember the proposal that you're voting on, any proposal that Federal subsistence covers, only deals with regulations on Federal land. There's only a very small amount of Federal land in 19(A) south of the Kuskokwim River. There's a small segment of the Yukon Kuskokwim -- Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, the pink on the western corner. There's a little bit of BLM land and there, and there's some scattered BLM parcels right below the Kuskokwim, and there's BLM land around the Lime Village area. In 19(B) there's only a tiny portion of BLM land on the eastern corner of 19(B) -- I'm sorry, the western, and then the Park Service land where I was discussing the Rainy Pass Herd, on the far eastern end.

32

33 That's pretty much everything I have. Thank you.

34

35 MR. GRAHAM: That'd be the Lake Clark park?

36

37 MR. GUENTHER: Yes, that's correct.

38

39 MR. HUNTINGTON: Thank you, Conrad. Jack?

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: In our area, there's no aircraft access into that park land, is there?

43

44 MR. GUENTHER: I don't know. I can't answer that. I'm sorry.

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: Lake Clark Park, are there any aircraft access permits for that portion?

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. TWITCHELL: Not within the park area specifically,  
 2 but most of the area represented in this map is in 19(B), a  
 3 State preserve category, in which case aircraft access can be  
 4 utilized in the preserve. There's very little land within  
 5 19(B) that falls under the Clark category.

6  
 7 MR. REAKOFF: And who is eligible to ac- -- everybody  
 8 would be eligible to access under any rural resident of this  
 9 what has C&T for 19? Would be able to utilize this Federal  
 10 hunt?

11  
 12 MR. TWITCHELL: As far as....

13  
 14 MR. REAKOFF: And the other questions are: Is that  
 15 readily accessible to aircraft? You guys live in that country.  
 16 Can you get up there with boats? That looks pretty high in  
 17 the hills.

18  
 19 MR. GRAHAM: It can be done, but I'd be -- could  
 20 somebody -- could a rural resident with an airplane land in  
 21 that preserve and hunt those Rainy Pass caribou?

22  
 23 MR. TWITCHELL: I'm not familiar on how far the  
 24 Rainy Pass caribou actually come down and whether they actually  
 25 enter into Lake Clark's National Park or not. In my  
 26 experiences working in Lake Clark for ten years, is that the  
 27 herd was primarily the Mulchatna herd, and it was primarily in  
 28 the park and preserve region. So I'm a little uncertain on  
 29 what the range and extent of the Rainy Pass caribou herd is.

30  
 31 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair? The Rainy Pass caribou herd,  
 32 would be -- an extreme edge of the range would be into  
 33 19(B). I didn't mean to imply that the herd was predominantly  
 34 19(B). It's not. It's out of 19(B), but the range  
 35 according to the State's publications would extend into 19(B).  
 36 They consider it a possible range area. How commonly it  
 37 occurs over there, I really have no information. There's not  
 38 very much information available on the Rainy Pass herd,  
 39 actually.

40  
 41 MR. TWITCHELL: And to try to get back to your question  
 42 who can subsistence hunt within the park area at Lake Clark,  
 43 there are a number of resident zone villages that anyone who  
 44 resides in those are be eligible. For instance, Lime Village  
 45 would be one. Nondalton would be another. Port Alsworth,  
 46 Kiamna, Newwhalin, Pedro Bay, are all resident zone  
 47 communities that have eligibility in that area. In addition to  
 48 those communities, there are several other individuals who have  
 49 separate permits from the park. I believe there's one

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

individual just off of the Teklanika Lake that has that authorization. Is that....(pause)

3

4 MR. REAKOFF: You guys down there that live down there, what do you think about all of that?

6

7 (Off record comments regarding transportation plans)

8

9 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman?

10

11 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.

12

13 MR. COFFING: I have a comment I want to toss around here. Based on from what I've seen since I've worked for Fish & Game out of Bethel, most of the hunting activity up in the area there from folks that are coming over, you know, the Mulchatna herd is much larger. It spreads over a much larger area. People that are coming out to go hunting, based on what I've seen in the State's harvest statistics report, they're not going in to focus the small Rainy Pass herd that's in an area that's much more rugged, much more difficult to get into. They're coming over and they're getting in areas where the Mulchatna herd is primarily located.

24

25 I don't want to dispel any concern that some Rainy Pass caribou might be harvested because certainly they might, but I think the focus on hunting activity is much more directed towards Mulchatna caribou and the geographic area that the Mulchatna caribou are found in.

30

31 One other point I wanted to mention is that regardless of what happens to the regulation, Lime Village is not impacted at all because this regulation does not apply to Lime Village. Lime Village is on a Federal quota of 200 caribou. They're not limited to five caribou anywhere. So the question of any impact by Lime Village on the population I think is probably not here because they're not affected by the regulation or the change.

39

40 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman? I'd like to make a few comments on that. I don't have any problems with this proposal because by the time these caribou herds, they get really lots, you know, and all of a sudden they crash, you know, and if they're allowed to catch, you know, five, maybe they'll kind of help that problem. And also, if they're allowed to catch at least five caribou, that will take pressure off the moose, too, you know. So I don't see any problem with this proposal.

48

49 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair? I guess the key point here

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1s that it really doesn't make a whole lot of difference what  
 2s done here because currently under State regulations you can  
 3ot anywhere in either one of those areas take five caribou.  
 4he only thing that really changes is that subsistence hunters  
 5n Federal lands now can take any five caribou. They could  
 6ake five bulls, where under State regulations they're only  
 7allowed two bulls and three -- well, they're allowed five cows.  
 8Any number of caribou up to five, but only two of those can be  
 9ulls. With this Federal regulation, you could take five bulls  
 10 you wanted five bulls. There's very little Federal land,  
 11d really as far as impact of the herd, nothing is going to  
 12hange here at all if you pass this regulation because you can  
 13ready do it except for the bull situation, and the reason the  
 14tate has a two-bull limit is because the herd is growing so  
 15ast that excess harvest of cows is not a problem with that  
 16erd. Otherwise, they would have it five bulls only if it was  
 17problem.

18

19 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman? You're referring to  
 20everal million -- or hundreds of thousands or millions of  
 21tres being declassified from State selection. Is that any of  
 22at BLM within this area here?

23

24 MR. DENTON: No.

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: It's not?

27

28 MR. DENTON: Most of the lands in 19(B) and that part  
 29 19(A), the white on this map, are TA(ph) lands from the  
 30tate. They've already been (inaudible -- away from  
 31icrophone) conveyance. This is a big block of State land. It  
 32 State land.

33

34 MR. REAKOFF: So not in the foreseeable future there  
 35ill probably be no....

36

37 MR. DENTON: Very little.

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: ....disallowment from the State on these  
 40tate lands.

41

42 MR. DENTON: No, but they've already -- in fact,  
 43everal years ago these were TA lands. These were top priority  
 44ands within the white block. They're already basically  
 45tentented State lands.

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: I see.

48

49 MR. DENTON: A big proportion of this, the whole

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

1inaudible).

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I'll move support of  
4 Proposal 38. I think that's the motion we need, isn't it? We  
5 want to go on record supporting this?

6

7 MR. REAKOFF: I'll second that.

8

9 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. Moved and second to adopt  
10 Proposal 38. Questions? (Pause) All in favor signify by  
11 saying aye.

12

13 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

14

15 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
16 Motion carries, 38.

17

18 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, could someone just briefly  
19 give a justification why you voted to adopt the substituted  
20 version of Proposal 38?

21

22 MR. HUNTINGTON: Anybody have a -- testify an answer  
23 for that?

24

25 MR. COLLINS: It aligns the seasons with the existing  
26 state's seasons, and biologically herd can sustain the  
27 additional harvest of one animal on that sliver of Federal  
28 land.

29

30 MR. GRAHAM: And maybe I could add that it doesn't seem  
31 like we're not affecting the Rainy Pass herd at all.

32

33 MR. COLLINS: Now, if for some reason this other one is  
34 considered, then I would have to oppose that because there is a  
35 problem to the north of there with that Beaver Mountain, and I  
36 don't know if we want -- I don't know if that's going to come  
37 up or not, but I would like it noted on the record that we --  
38 would personally at least be opposed to any additional  
39 harvest north of the river where the Beaver Mountain herd is,  
40 cause it's -- we've been watching it for years and it's just  
41 staying pretty small. It can't sustain any more than the one  
42 harvest right now. So I don't know whether we need to go on  
43 record with that or not here.

44

45 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would hurt  
46 to go on record. If the council would adopt that motion, then  
47 it would be clear when we carry it across to YK Delta in case  
48 they don't substitute this. Most likely they'll take the  
49 substitution. But just in case, it's just another line or two

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

that we need to carry over, so I would recommend that you do pass a motion that you would -- if the council agrees that they would be in opposition to the original Proposal 38 because of concerns of the Beaver Mountain or....

5  
6 MR. COLLINS: I'll move that, Mr. Chair, for the reasons stated, because of the Beaver Mountain herd.

8  
9 MR. REAKOFF: I'll second that.

10  
11 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded.

12  
13 MR. MORGAN: May I ask for some clarification? Where  
14 this Beaver Mountain that we're talking about?

15  
16 MR. COLLINS: The Beaver Mountains are between McGrath and Shageluk, and that's where -- north of the river those -- they move down in that area occasionally, I guess. They're actually around Moore Creek on the map. I think it's on the map here. Yeah. The Beavers are right out there around Moore Creek, which is north of Georgetown there. They're the ones that come down in your area, too. That's a small, small herd.

24  
25 MR. HUNTINGTON: Conrad?

26  
27 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, just for comment on the record regarding Beaver Mountain herd, the Beaver Mountain herd the original -- was the herd of concern in the original proposal, which would have been north of the Kuskokwim River. The state expressed it was opposed to an increased harvest in the Beaver Mountain herd because of the small size, and if the proposal was adopted to expand the limit on the north side of the river, that it be restricted to a five- to ten-mile band north of the river to protect the Beaver Mountain herd.

36  
37 Just to give you a brief bit of information on the Beaver Mountain herd, it's a very small herd. It's estimated at between 1,200 and 1,500 animals. It's generally considered stable, but it's one of these herds that there's very, very poor information on. The size actually could be substantially smaller than that. One data base that I read had the Beaver Mountain herd as small as 700 animals. So it probably really ranges between 700 and 1,500 animals, definitely not in excess of 1,500. It's a herd that has to be watched. It's just such a small herd that a large harvest on the herd could be very detrimental. That's all I have.

48  
49 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any more questions on the motion?

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1(Pause) All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

2

3 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

4

5 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)

6 Motion carries.

7

8 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings us to  
9 Proposal 39, which is the proposal your council drafted at your  
10 last meeting, and that is to change the regulations for moose  
11 hunting in Unit 21(A) and 21(E), and I think it's clear in the  
12 proposal packet what that is. I can read it in, but  
13 essentially it changes the fall season in 21(A) from  
14 September 5th starting date to August 20th and closing date  
15 from September 30th to September 10th, change the harvest limit  
16 one bull. And for 21(E) the original season was September  
17 5th to the 25th. Your proposal was to change it to August 20th  
18 September 10th, and harvest limit would be one bull.

19

20 And I'll summarize the public comments that were  
21 received and then let you get into the details with the staff.  
22 Proposal 39, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game opposed  
23 that. You have a copy of their oppositions in your book. I  
24 will summarize it. They opposed it. "In Unit 21(A) the vast  
25 majority of hunting pressure is from non-local, fly-in hunters  
26 that seek large-antlered moose. Less than 10 percent of the  
27 reported hunters are residents of Unit 21. Very little hunting  
28 effort is exerted by local residents in 21(A). The moose  
29 population in the area is not being threatened by the present  
30 season dates, so there is no biological reason for the proposed  
31 change. Likewise, the proposed change of the bag limit from  
32 one antlered moose to one bull for August-September hunting  
33 season is unnecessary. In both units the landownership  
34 boundaries between State and Federal jurisdictions are  
35 difficult to identify for enforcing regulations. We should  
36 strive to align State and Federal seasons to preclude  
37 enforcement problems. This proposal would do the opposite,  
38 further complicating the problem." That's the reasonings for  
39 why Alaska Department of Fish & Game opposed 30, and I do need  
40 note that your proposal was submitted to the Board of Game  
41 and you will be discussing the same proposal under Board of  
42 Game later on your agenda.

43

44 With that, I'll turn it over to the other staff to give  
45 you biological and social-cultural information.

46

47 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, since we're dealing with  
48 two areas, 21(A) and 21(E), that are quite different and the  
49 biology is somewhat different on them, let me deal with each

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

One of those areas separately in my discussion.

2

3 First we'll deal with Units 21(A), which what's  
 4 happening here is we're changing the season dates from  
 5 September 1 through 30 to August 10 through September 10, and  
 6 again, the purpose of this proposal was primarily to protect  
 7 the moose population in those two units. In Unit 21(A) this  
 8 supports a moderate moose population that generally appears to  
 9 be a stable population. In this area 21(A), if you look at the  
 10 large map, if you're not familiar with the area you can  
 11 somewhat follow what we're talking about. We're primarily  
 12 talking about two parcels of Federal lands: The Nowitna and  
 13 the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge.

14

15 UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible - away from microphone)

16

17 MR. GUENTHER: I'm sorry. What?

18

19 UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible)

20

21 MR. GUENTHER: I'm sorry. The Nowitna and Innoko  
 22 National Wildlife Refuge. There are a few small parcels of  
 23 BLM land scattered throughout that area. Data from a 1980 and  
 24 1993 survey -- again, there's limited survey data on this  
 25 map, indicate that in the Hour Creek area -- and the Hour Creek  
 26 is located -- on that portion of the Nowitna on the eastern end  
 27 of 19(A), you've got kind of a finger of pink that goes up the  
 28 Nowitna River? Hour Creek area is almost to the very southern  
 29 end of that and it's a small drainage. It's the last drainage  
 30 that's partially on refuge lands off of the Nowitna.

31

32 Of the two surveys that were done, the indications are  
 33 that bull:cow ratios have changed significantly in that area.  
 34 In 1980 there was a bull:cow ratio of forty bulls per  
 35 hundred cows. In the 1993 survey there was a bull:cow ratio of  
 36 thirteen bulls per hundred cows. This is probably the result  
 37 of high fly-in hunting pressure in that area.

38

39 Unit 21(A) tends to be a high-elevation area. Moose  
 40 hunting is primarily accessible by aircraft. There's very  
 41 little hunting off of the river. It's basically too far up the  
 42 river where they're hunting up in this area in Federal land.  
 43 They do come up the Nowitna, but a lot of the access is by  
 44 aircraft in that area.

45

46 The hunters are basically non-local hunters. According  
 47 to reported harvest, the actual local hunter harvest in the  
 48 areas on Federal land in 21(A) comprised somewhere less than  
 49 25 percent of the total harvest, so very few animals, and I

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515



I can give you absolute numbers on that if you want. I've broken it out for that whole area.

3

4 In that area hunter success rate is relatively high. Generally throughout 19(A), the moose populations, the Hour Creek area is the only area that we really have information on that the population is in trouble, or at least the bull:cow ratios are in trouble. Throughout the rest of the area, it's thought that generally the populations are stable and in fairly good shape. There is some indication that on the refuge area -- on the Nowitna Refuge area, it may be more extensive than just the Hour Creek area of the problem with bull:cow ratios, but there's no hard data that would point to that.

15

16 In 19(A) rural residents -- oh, I'm sorry. In 21(A) -- rural residents of 21(A), 21(E), and residents of Takotna, McGrath, Aniak, and Crooked Creek have C&T. Of the number of moose that were taken by federally-qualified subsistence hunters in the area -- now, this is in all of 19(A). The figure I gave you before of less than 2.5 percent was -- what I calculated was just on Federal lands. In all of 19(A) less than 5 percent -- why do I do that? Too many 19(A) moose problems. In 21(A) approximately 4.8 percent of the reported harvest of moose, approximately 30 moose out of 631 moose were taken by local hunters, and that's in the whole area.

27

28 The major problem with changing the season dates is that the State at this time does not propose changing its season dates, and so what would happen is that if the Federal Board changes the season dates to what's been proposed in this proposal and the State retained its season dates as they now exist, instead of decreasing the amount of time to hunt moose, we'd increase the moose season by a total of 26 days, and so if we're looking at a proposal here to protect moose populations, the question whether increasing the season by 26 days is giving the moose population additional protection.

38 Another point that was mentioned by the State but was not in their write-up is they have a concern relative to meat spoilage from a season that starts in August, partially because if you're traveling on the river, you probably by the time you get up into this area to hunt, that it may take more than a day so to get out, and with warm weather, you know, it's possible to have problems with moose meat. Now, that's a State concern. It was discussed in our office. We do not look at it as a concern because we feel that people are careful enough so that if they do have warm weather, they're not going to shoot a moose in a situation where they're going to have to be out for a few days before they can get it somewhere where they can

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

protect the meat. So we did not see that as a specific problem, but it could be a problem.

3

4 Another problem is that on-the-ground identification of Federal boundaries with these scattered parcels is very difficult up here, so that's a potential problem. Additional problem is that hunting off of the rivers -- and again, this is the same problem for both of these areas, 21(E) and 21(A), that all of the rivers are under State jurisdiction, and they're under State jurisdiction to the high-water line, the mean or ordinary high-water line, and so any moose that's below that mean or ordinary high-water line would be on State properties, and so this potentially causes a problem for the subsistence hunters because the State will enforce that regulation even though the Federal season dates would be different and it may put somebody in jeopardy, as is the case that happened to some people out of McGrath a couple of years ago.

18

19 Now let's go back and talk about 21(E), and I'll try to call it 21(E) and not 19-something. 21(E) is a very different situation. 21(E), the hunting is almost exclusively off of rivers. It's a lowland area. We're talking about primarily BLM land scattered through 21(E) and a small portion of refuge lands on the upper Innoko River.

25

26 Data from 21(E) indicates that there are high cow:calf ratios. The latest surveys that were done would indicate calf ratios of as high as 46 calves per 100 cows, and in 1987 they had bull ratios of approximately 28 bulls per 100 cows. Again, this is hunting off of the river corridor. The area has a relatively high success rate. It actually has a high moose population. There's some indication -- the State feels this may be some of the highest moose that's ever occurred in that area, and the moose population seems to be growing in that area. Rural residents that have C&T in 21(E) are residents of Russian Mission, which is in Unit 18, and then rural residents of 21(E).

38

39 Federally qualified subsistence users take about 40 percent of the moose harvested in that area, and this is again reported harvest data. This is based on the State's harvest survey data base. Based on the reported locations of harvest and the accessibility of Federal public lands, I anticipate that significantly less than half of the 150 moose that were taken in the last five years were actually taken on Federal public lands.

47

48 Now, since with this proposal we also would be changing the February season to a bulls-only season where now you can

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Hunt any moose, the proposal would change this so that it would have to be a bull. I pulled up some data on the cow harvest, and the reported cow harvest in 21(E) from 1989 to 1993, there were only twelve cows harvested. Six of those cows were harvested by federally-eligible subsistence hunters. So over a five-year period, we've had six cows harvested. The number of those cows that were actually harvested on Federal lands, I really couldn't figure that out, but it's still a very small number of cows.

10

11 It would seem to me with what appears to be a healthy moose population throughout that area, 21(E), that is, that the -- and with the small reported cow harvest, unless there's a very much higher unreported cow harvest, that to restrict local users to not be able to harvest cows during that period is probably not biologically justifiable from the data that I have.

18

19 Again, we run into the same problem we did in 21(A). 20 the State does not change their season, which at this time 21 we've been informed they do not plan on changing their season dates to match this season date, and the Federal season date was changed as it's requested in the proposal, we would 24 increase the moose season by an additional 21 days in 25 hit 21(E).

26

27 It would appear to me from the biological point of view that if the purpose of this proposal is to protect the moose populations in that area and given the fact that it appears that the State is not willing to change its moose seasons to correspond to these dates, that extending the season additional days would not give the moose the protection that the proposal was hoping that it would, and it appears that the proposal has possibly missed its point.

35

36 If you look at the table that I pulled together on the last page of that, right up -- it's on page number 7, it'll give you some idea of what the cow harvest has been for the areas that have C&T in 21(E). The first chart is a chart of 20(A), and it shows the total harvest for the five villages that are C&T eligible villages right now, gives you the total subsistence harvest for that period from 1989 to '93 for each year, and then the total harvest -- the last column is a total harvest for all hunters. In Table 2, it's 21(E), the number below the slash is the cow harvest. The number above the slash is the bull harvest. Again, the four villages that are identified are the ones that eligible C&T villages in 21(E) under Federal regulations, and again, the last column is the total of all harvest including cows, and then the next column

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

to the left is the total subsistence harvest of those  
four eligible villages, and the second figure after the slash  
would be cows.

4

5 Just to reiterate again what this proposal does, in  
21(A) it changes the fall season from September 1 through 30 to  
August 10 through September 10. In 21(E) it eliminates the  
taking of cows during the winter season, and it changes the  
fall season from September 5 through 25 to August 10 through  
September 10. The change of the wording of -- from "antlered"  
to "any bulls" from a biological standpoint is probably  
insignificant. All that it does is allow someone to take a  
bull that has not developed antlers yet. In other words, bull  
of the year or for some reason a bull that didn't develop  
antlers, which would be pretty uncommon. And so it's more or  
less just a wording change.

17

18 Again, I have a lot of data on this and have a lot of  
break-out of harvest dates and information by specific areas  
scattered around through the units. I can answer questions if  
you have additional questions. That's all I have, though, at  
this time.

23

24 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any questions for Conrad? (Pause)  
Hearing none, I....

26

27 MR. DEACON: I have a question.

28

29 MR. HUNTINGTON: Oh. Henry?

30

31 MR. DEACON: Do they propose this proposal we made last  
fall?

33

34 MR. GUENTHER: I'm sorry?

35

36 MR. DEACON: Do they oppose it?

37

38 MR. GUENTHER: Do I oppose it?

39

40 MR. DEACON: Who opposed it?

41

42 MR. GUENTHER: The State is in opposition to this  
proposal. My position on it, I'm not for or against the  
proposal. My feelings are as I stated, that if the purpose of  
the proposal was to offer additional protection to those moose,  
that it may have missed its mark since it would tend to make a  
much longer season when you combine the State and the Federal  
season.

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. DEACON: You know, that part don't make sense to  
 2 me. Here we're to suggest these and the State say it's the  
 3 wrong way. You know, I don't know. And we have (inaudible -  
 4 mumbled speech) board that's in line with this proposal that we  
 5 set up last winter, you know. So I know we're for this  
 6 proposal, and who opposes it, I think the State opposed it, so  
 7 is there any way we can appeal that position, because I don't  
 8 feel it's right.

9  
 10 MR. GUENTHER: I guess what my recommendation would be,  
 11 Mr. Deacon, is that I'm not opposed to the seasons -- the  
 12 change of the dates for the season, that we're not expressing  
 13 an opposition to that, but if the State does not change its  
 14 season dates, it makes a very long season. What would be  
 15 appropriate possibly for you to pursue -- or for this council  
 16 pursue would be to try to get the State Board of Game to  
 17 change its season dates to align with these season dates if we  
 18 feel these -- if you feel these season dates are more  
 19 appropriate than the existing State season dates. The concern  
 20 that I have is that if the State does not change those season  
 21 dates, that it makes a very long moose season.

22  
 23 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman? I'd like to comment on  
 24 that, too. You said that there's no biological reason, you  
 25 know, so even though it's a little longer, in this case I don't  
 26 see what the problem is for extending the season. If there was  
 27 a problem, you know, then I'd voice it, but I don't see no  
 28 problem for having a longer season there.

29  
 30 MR. GUENTHER: Just as a point of clarification,  
 31 there -- what I mentioned was that the proposal stated in the  
 32 proposal that it was to give additional protection to the  
 33 moose, and since this proposal was presented by this council,  
 34 it is to give additional protection, then the council needs  
 35 consider if that does occur with the longer season. From a  
 36 biological basis, you're probably correct, that for the  
 37 subsistence user, particularly in Unit 21(E), we have a good  
 38 moose population. We do not seem to be hurting the moose  
 39 population at this time. It's possible that the increased  
 40 number of days in the season would not have a significant  
 41 impact on that herd. I would guess that it probably would not  
 42 because we only have, what is it, four or five villages that  
 43 have access -- have C&T eligibility for that. In 21(A) it  
 44 probably would not from a subsistence standpoint, because there  
 45 is such a small number of people that actually harvest moose in  
 46 21(A).

47  
 48 So the increased season again would mean total moose  
 49 harvest -- a small increase in the total moose harvest. But  
 50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

again, it makes the possibility of a longer season, increased-harvest possibility. If the purpose is to protect the moose by shortening the season, which I think was the original intent when this was discussed last fall, it doesn't do that. From a biological perspective, the additional length in season for Federal subsistence hunters probably will not have a significant impact on the moose.

8

Now, I hope I haven't confused the issue, but again, it's up to you to make that decision, and I've given you, you know, the best information I have and I can give you a lot more if you'd like. But I'm not expressing an opinion in opposition to it. I just made some observations that occurred to me as I was developing the analysis of this. If that's not clear, I'll try to clarify it.

16

MR. DEACON: You say moose season might open August 20th and stay open till when?

19

MR. GUENTHER: The State season at this time -- let me -- the State season in Unit 21(A) at this time is September 1 through September 30th. That is also the current Federal subsistence season. In 21(A) this proposal would delay the opening of the moose season until -- or I'm sorry. Would you open the moose season up earlier by opening up August 10th. So you would have -- now the season would start August 10th, if this proposal was passed, and would run through September 10th, and at the same time the State season would be opening September 1st and running through the 30th. So in reality what happens is you would have a Federal season that opened August 10th and the season would extend and run through the end of September, so almost two-month long season. The....

33

UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible - simultaneous speech)

35

MR. COLLINS: No. That's only ten days longer now in August. From the 20th to the 30th of August.

38

MR. GUENTHER: No, no. August 10, not 20th. It would open August 10 with this proposal.

41

MR. COLLINS: The proposal is that it's August 20th, from the copy I'm reading.

44

45

MR. GUENTHER: Well, it's written wrong in this. I'm sorry. I have two different dates. Can you clarify, Vince, how the proposal did come in? I have two dates here.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. MATHEWS: Well, the proposal that was submitted is  
 2 for August 20th. The change that's requested is August 20th  
 3 through September 10th for 21(A), and for 21(E) it's  
 4 August 20th through September 10th. State seasons, you already  
 5 mentioned, are September 5 through the 25th for 21(A), and for  
 6 21(E) it's September 5 through the 25th, also.

7  
 8 MR. COLLINS: No. He was staying the State is one  
 9 day -- the existing Federal one is five to thirty. Is that  
 10 right?

11  
 12 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, I gave you State seasons. Okay.

13  
 14 MR. COLLINS: My point of clarification now is -- is  
 15 the ones above the existing Federal or is that the State?

16  
 17 MR. MATHEWS: No. That's existing Federal.

18  
 19 MR. COLLINS: So the Federal season is now five days  
 20 shorter than the State. Is that right? It opens September 1?

21  
 22 MR. COFFING: The only difference between the seasons  
 23 you see above here on the September date -- for Unit 21(E), the  
 24 State and Federal season are both September 5 to 25, for 21(E).  
 25 September -- for Unit 21(E) above the existing regulation --  
 26 the one for the Federal season. The State season also  
 27 opens September 5 but closes September 25, so the only  
 28 difference here, the State season closes five days earlier in  
 29 21(E).

30  
 31 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, I had the wrong figure in  
 32 what I was working on, so actually the only change in what I've  
 33 said would be that the proposed season would open August 20th  
 34 instead of August 10. So it would be ten days' difference. So  
 35 the season would run August 20th through September 10th, but  
 36 since the State season opens September 5th and runs through the  
 37 30th, you would actually have a season running August 20  
 38 through September 30th.

39  
 40 MR. DEACON: That goes for Federal land, too?

41  
 42 MR. GUENTHER: Yes. That would be on Federal land.

43  
 44 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify. The  
 45 State season closes September 25 in both areas, not the 30th as  
 46 mentioned. (Pause) Would you like me to try to clear the air  
 47 kind of muddy it up? Which? Okay.

48  
 49 MR. DEACON: Mr. Chairman?

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

1  
2 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, Henry.  
3  
4 MR. DEACON: I still don't understand. I understand it  
5 good, but, you know, instead of all these guys going in their  
6 own local areas and saying -- you know, giving suggestions and  
7 all that stuff, and yet the State comes in and sets the date  
8 and that's what you go by, and I don't know if that's fair.  
9 It's not fair to me, and in Fort Yukon, I understand that they  
10 say they got to close the Gas(ph) Board there. They can close  
11 the season. They say too much hunters there. They can --  
12 those or whatever. They can just close the season there. Is  
13 that true?  
14  
15 MR. GUENTHER: You're asking if we can close Federal  
16 land?  
17  
18 MR. DEACON: I mean the local area.  
19  
20 MR. GUENTHER: If....  
21  
22 MR. DEACON: The State Gas Board.  
23  
24 MR. GUENTHER: I really can't speak for the State....  
25  
26 MR. DEACON: Oh, I -- yeah.  
27  
28 MR. GUENTHER: ....on how they can open and close  
29 seasons. They can close seasons by emergency order.  
30  
31 MR. DEACON: Those are the things that -- you know, a  
32 lot of people I talk to, that August 20th to September 10th was  
33 good thing for our area, for those villages, and I, you know,  
34 checked that out before I said anything. I thought it was the  
35 best thing to bring up in this board meeting. That's what I  
36 did, and I took a stand, because that's what the people wanted.  
37 That's what they sent me over here for. (Inaudible - mumbled  
38 speech) What's the use of having this board here?  
39  
40 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Deacon, just so we're clear, I'm not  
41 opposed to those season dates, and biologically there's no  
42 problem with those season dates.  
43  
44 MR. DEACON: I'm not saying you're opposed to....  
45  
46 MR. GUENTHER: Right.  
47  
48 MR. DEACON: ....State and Federal. I don't accuse  
49 individual of this. The way the Federal and State work, and I  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



can see that, the State is not in line with the Federal. They don't listen to Federal.

3

4 MR. HUNTINGTON: Gloria?

5

6 MS. MASCHMEYER: I just had a comment in listening to the conversations back and forth here, and maybe some clarification could be that at the C&T meeting for this past month on the 13th and 14th, the solicitor, which is kind of the lawyer for the Department of the Interior, was there and clarified a lot of things, and one thing that he mentioned was that these Federal regulations are to reflect subsistence uses on the land. So possibly that will help you in your decision-making because they are to reflect how you actually use the land as subsistence users, and then, you know, we are supposed to, as the Federal government, look at that and say is that, you know, biologically sound or so forth. But still, you know, the ball is in your court to reflect your use as subsistence users. That's what regional councils are all about.

20

21 MR. HUNTINGTON: Vince?

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: As I mentioned earlier but I feel like I need to mention again, this same proposal was submitted to the Board of Game. It will be before the Board of Game in their March meeting. It is a fair assumption that if the Alaska Department of Fish & Game opposes it under the Federal side, I would assume they would oppose it under the State when it comes before the State Board. So then that would end up with your seasons, which is fine, to be different on State and Federal lands. I just want to make that clear to you.

32

33 Now, the -- I'm not saying the State Board of Game will just go with what the Department is saying. They could adopt the proposal that you submitted to them, and then that way your proposal under this one, if you adopt it and the Federal Board adopts it, would be mirrored in the State regulations. So again, this same proposal was submitted to Board of Game. It is in the Board of Game proposal book, and it's before the Board of Game in March. But the Department has already spoken out against it under the Federal side. Most likely they'll oppose it under the State side. But they're not here, so I can't speak for them.

44

45 MR. HUNTINGTON: Gloria?

46

47 MS. MASCHMEYER: Just to add what Vince is telling you, brings up another comment that the solicitor brought up to the group in the meeting, and that was that you can go around in

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

circles forever with what-ifs and you'll never figure that out, so basically start with what you're trying to do and take the process from there.

4

5 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I feel that if the representative from that area and the people of that area want to harvest moose in August and early September, that it should be our position to back their wishes, and if the biologists think this Federal subsistence hunt -- an earlier hunt, will it be detrimental to the moose population?

11

12 MR. GUENTHER: If you're asking my opinion, the extension of the Federal subsistencies will not have a significant impact on the moose population in either one of these subunits.

16

17 MR. REAKOFF: So it's my opinion that if the State doesn't go along, too bad. If the people of that area want to hunt moose early and make dry meat, which I know a lot of people upriver like to make dry meat that time of year on a fat moose, then fine, I'm for them.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: I think they'll probably go in the freezer, most of them.

25

26 MR. GRAHAM: I just wanted to ask Mr. Deacon: Is that for people who want to hunt early? Is that -- in the villages around you? Is that 21(E)? Hunting early?

29

30 MR. DEACON: You know, you kind of hate to see some hunters coming by the hundreds and just slaughter moose around our part of the country, outsiders, and anytime after September 20, you know, those moose are rutting and they start moving around -- running around. Anybody can get moose now -- at those times. But really, people that live there, they know how to -- they know where to get the moose. They don't have to wait for them to move around too much. And those are the seasons, and the population of moose, too. You say there's a lot of moose now. You know, I don't -- it's hard for me to believe the numbers that you gave out, but I -- it's more moose than that killed out there. I'm from that area.

42

43 MR. HUNTINGTON: Let's get on with the rest of the agenda here. We can probably talk about this all day, but I think we've got a lot of things to cover yet, and I'd like to keep on moving. Is there a motion on the floor to adopt this proposal?

48

49 MR. GRAHAM: I move we adopt this proposal, Number 39.

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. HUNTINGTON: Motion on the floor to adopt  
~~Number~~ 39. Is there a second?  
4  
5 MR. COLLINS: Second.  
6  
7 MR. DEACON: Discussion.  
8  
9 MR. HUNTINGTON: Discussion?  
10  
11 MR. DEACON: I'd like to amend that to make it into  
~~10~~st last August 20 in this, so you still save ten days.  
13  
14 MR. HUNTINGTON: From August 20th to what?  
15  
16 MR. DEACON: If the State will go for subsistence, so  
~~we~~ wouldn't have so long a season. I'd like to amend that  
~~section~~, delete that from (inaudible - mumbled speech). That's  
~~my~~ motion.  
20  
21 MR. HUNTINGTON: There's a motion on the floor. We  
~~need~~ed to accept it or reject it.  
23  
24 MR. GRAHAM: Can it be amended?  
25  
26 MR. COLLINS: I don't understand, Henry. What do you  
~~want~~ to do now? If the State doesn't change theirs, you want  
~~to~~ do what?  
29  
30 MR. DEACON: Well, the State now -- we open up  
~~August~~ 20th, just add ten more days to it, and we'll go with  
~~the~~ State. Just that much less waste. So that's my motion.  
33  
34 MR. HUNTINGTON: So the season will go from August 20th  
~~to~~ what?  
36  
37 MR. DEACON: No, September. Whatever the State says.  
38  
39 MR. HUNTINGTON: Oh. Right now?  
40  
41 MR. DEACON: So we don't have a long season.  
42  
43 MR. COLLINS: But the only ones out in that early one  
~~would~~ be the subsistence users. So you're going to cut off the  
~~subsistence~~ use to everybody? Everybody should do it the 1st  
~~of~~ September?  
47  
48 MR. DEACON: What is subsistence users? Guys from  
~~anywhere~~ all over?  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

MR. COLLINS: No, not under Federal regs. They're residents of the -- who are subsistence users in this area? Has it been defined?

MR. COFFING: In 21(E) it is -- the communities in 21 are Shageluk, Grayling, Anvik, Holy Cross, and Russian Mission. Those are the qualified Federal subsistence users.

MR. COLLINS: Those are the only ones under your proposal from August 20 to September 1. Then after that it would be open for everybody.

MR. DEACON: I see. I go for that.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Can you state that, again? I think I'm kind of confused on the dates.

MR. COLLINS: Well, I think he wants to withdraw his motion. He was going to change it to go along with the State dates, but now he -- he wasn't clear that it was just affecting those -- the Federal season just affects those communities, the dates that are resident of 21 plus those two other communities.

MR. MORGAN: Can I make a comment? It says here: But would enhance future hunting by protecting the moose population; and it seemed like you had a problem with that. That part can be deleted. That last sentence, by protecting the moose population, 'cause that will give them more ammunition to oppose it. They'll just say, "Well, it doesn't protect the moose population." Amend it to delete that last sentence there: by protecting the moose population.

MR. HUNTINGTON: So you want to delete that last sentence?

MR. MORGAN: If it's okay with the members.

MR. GRAHAM: I think it's -- you're saying this is not going to protect the moose population. What it is, is it's going to give an opportunity for subsistence users to get an early moose if they want.

MR. MORGAN: Yeah.

MR. GRAHAM: And we aren't really protecting them. That isn't a reason anymore.

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. The way it's written now, it's --  
2 Yeah.

3

4 MR. COFFING: Mr. Chairman? I want to, if I may, offer  
5 comment. Along the line of what I think Herman was saying and  
6 also Phil, if one of your goals here is to provide a season  
7 that reasonably accommodates subsistence uses, maybe that's  
8 something you want to say. I don't know if you want to  
9 necessarily in your proposal say that, but I think you might  
10 want to make that clear, that if one of your goals is to change  
11 the season dates earlier to accommodate subsistence uses, then  
12 think that ought to be said up front so that the Subsistence  
13 Board understands that you're trying to accommodate subsistence  
14 uses. I just I'd make that real clear to them.

15

16 MR. MATHEWS: And that would come under your  
17 justification, 'cause I think you're asking to amend the reason  
18 for changing the regulation, et cetera. That may end up with  
19 the same results, but it's going to be a bit confusing to carry  
20 through. I think it would be wiser, if you are going to pass  
21 supporting this proposal -- this is your proposal, so I would  
22 tend to think that you're supporting and not adopting it. But  
23 that's semantics. And that you would -- strong in your  
24 justification that you're trying to reflect traditional --  
25 customary and traditional hunting seasons, and that's fine.  
26 Instead of going in here and changing the -- I'm not sure how I  
27 would handle changing that. I know you can amend your  
28 proposal, but it would be cleaner just to do that, and Mike is  
29 going to be at the YK Delta, and so he'll be able to relay what  
30 you have said here, also, in addition to other information.

31

32 So is that clear? That's in your justification to do  
33 that, the reasons why you are continuing to support this,  
34 cause it reflects the traditional harvest practices of  
35 residents of that area.

36

37 MR. COLLINS: I think, though, they had a second intent  
38 mind. That's why you submitted the State one, and that was  
39 cut off some days at the end when the bulls are so  
40 vulnerable. They did want to shorten it. Now, the Federal,  
41 that's not going to affect the State season, but I still think  
42 they want to put pressure on the State to shorten their season  
43 at the end, maybe to come in line with this so that it would  
44 reduce harvest of the time -- when bulls are not so edible,  
45 anyhow. You know, that last five days. That's what they're  
46 saying: Why subsistence hunt then when the bulls are all run  
47 down. Let's shorten that and give opportunity on the end when  
48 they're still in good shape.

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. MATHEWS: But you -- if I understand correctly,  
 2 you'd have the option, 'cause your proposal under the State one  
 3 is, I think, Proposal 121. You could amend that one, amend  
 4 your one that's before the State Board of Game to say you want  
 5 -- you could amend it to make the shorter season -- earlier  
 6 closing date to protect. You could do that. But right now  
 7 what's on the table is the proposal that's before the Federal  
 8 Board. So you're kind of confusing us here a little bit, which  
 9 is okay.

10

11 MR. HUNTINGTON: Sharon?

12

13 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: Yes. I can support this for  
 14 subsistence reasons because this is a good time for family  
 15 units to go camping with the children, to do the berry-picking  
 16 and the story telling, and if they should harvest an animal,  
 17 that's all part of the education of the children. I can  
 18 support this. This is a good time. It's before school starts,  
 19 half of it anyway, so I would suppose this.

20

21 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any more discussion on Proposal 39  
 22 before we take a vote? (Pause) All in favor to the motion,  
 23 signify by saying aye.

24

25 ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

26

27 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign? (Pause)  
 28 Motion carries.

29

30 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, either we could dispense of  
 31 our actions with proposal under the State side or wait till we  
 32 go to State proposals.

33

34 MR. HUNTINGTON: Why don't we go to State proposals?

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Because the State proposals are the same  
 37 proposal. We could get it out of the way now if you want to.

38

39 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, I guess.

40

41 MR. MATHEWS: Is that okay? Okay. Under tab -- I  
 42 don't know. You guys got ahead of me here. The last tab is  
 43 the proposal before the Board of Game. It's essentially the  
 44 exact same proposal. What I would do then is be charged --  
 45 whatever action you take with your proposal, to make sure those  
 46 comments have gotten to the Board of Game by March 8th. So  
 47 it's the same proposal. I heard discussion. I'm not saying  
 48 that's the way you wanted to go, but there was discussion about  
 49 amending that proposal before the State Board so -- I think I

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

lost you guys.

2

3 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, I think so. I'm....

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. What I'm saying is that when you  
~~d~~rafted this proposal last fall and you submitted one exactly  
~~t~~he same to the State Board, I just thought out of convenience  
~~s~~ince we discussed this issue, to bring up that proposal under  
~~t~~he State Board. And do you continue to support that or do you  
~~w~~ant to reject it or do you want to amend it?

11

12 MR. COLLINS: Well, 122 was addressing a different  
 13 sue. That has to do with the half-mile and the river.

14

15 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. There's another one that follows  
~~t~~hat that deals with the half-mile, but half-mile restriction  
~~o~~n the Innoko River.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: Oh, I'm sorry. I see, 121.

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: But I'm just saying to close out the  
 22 sue that surrounds 39, we could address the State proposal at  
~~t~~he same time. Either that or we could bring it up later, and  
 24 am getting two messages from you. One message is that you  
 25 tally support the proposal as written, but then I also heard  
~~t~~hat there was talk about changing the closing date. If there  
 27 none, then your earlier action would have give the intent  
~~t~~hat you support the State one. So I apologize for trying to  
~~g~~ive you a little push in one direction, but....(pause)

30

31 MR. COLLINS: Still want this one for the State? You  
~~w~~ant the State to adopt this one?

33

34 MS. MASCHMEYER: Mr. Chairman? For clarification since  
~~w~~e're all running around in circles, the State regulation  
~~a~~ppears to be the same as Proposal 39 that you had just  
~~a~~dopted. The change that we have made, and it's not really a  
~~c~~hange, but it's a change in the justification and that now we  
~~a~~re justifying the proposal change because it reflects the  
~~a~~ctual usage and desires of subsistence users, but it does not  
~~n~~ecessarily biologically support protection of the population.  
~~s~~o the State -- you may want to have it read the same. I think  
~~t~~hat that's what -- the dates are exactly the same, seasons are  
~~t~~he same, but the justification now is something different.

45

46 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that  
~~t~~he local people wanted an earlier moose hunt without  
~~c~~ompetition from outside hunters. If we pass this Proposal 121  
~~t~~he Game Board, that will allow all fly-in hunters to come

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

in to compete on August 20th and the Game Board passes this proposal. Fly-in hunters will then -- we'll be back to square one again. They'll be competing with non-local hunters.

4

5 It's my opinion that we should withdraw 121 to the State Game Board so that there will be a dissimilar season and give the local people the advantage to hunt the early moose.

8

9 MR. MATHEWS: Should I pass out some coffee or....

10

11 (General laughter)

12

13 MR. HUNTINGTON: How about another five-minute break or something? We're getting to where we're just spinning our wheels right now.

16

17 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

18

19 (Off record)

20 (On record)

21

22 MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay. Can we get the meeting back to order here and get on with the agenda? (Pause) Ray, can we get started?

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chair. I think before we broke we were talking about Proposal 121 before the Board of Game, and I just want to share some information that Cesa just shared with me, is that the -- remember the cover dish dinner is at 30x and that it will also be with -- which will be great, with the schools that are visiting. So we will be moving tables around probably about ten till six, just so you know.

33

34 Okay. 121 was before you, which is the same proposal that you submitted to the Federal Board that is now going to be before the State Board, and you were going to look at that to decide what to do with Proposal 121, the State one. (Pause) And there was discussion about removing that -- asking to withdraw that proposal, and it was just discussion, not a motion, to withdraw Proposal 121 before the board so that it wouldn't end up in increased harvest in that area under the All-Alaskan Rule.

43

44 UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible - whispered speech)

45

46 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I'm getting all these good words. Concentrating harvest because of the All-Alaskan Rule and cetera.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



1  
2 MR. COLLINS: You want us to do that, Henry? Do you  
~~w~~ant us to withdraw this one? Just pull it off?  
4  
5 MR. DEACON: What do you think, Herman?  
6  
7 MR. MORGAN: It's up to you.  
8  
9 MR. DEACON: It's not up to me. It's all of us.  
10  
11 MR. COLLINS: I'll vote that we withdraw Proposal 121.  
12  
13 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved to withdraw  
~~P~~proposal 121. Is there a second?  
15  
16 MR. DEACON: Second.  
17  
18 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any questions?  
19  
20 MR. DEACON: Call for question.  
21  
22 MR. HUNTINGTON: Question's been called for. All in  
~~f~~avor of withdrawing Proposal 121, signify by saying aye.  
24  
25 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.  
26  
27 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
~~M~~otion carries. Proposal 121 withdrawn.  
29  
30 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, that brings us back  
~~B~~ Federal proposals, and that brings us up to Proposal 40.  
~~P~~proposal 40 is your proposal, and that is to add a half-mile  
~~R~~estriction on the Innoko River during the February 1 through  
~~3~~0th season for moose. The comments that were received on  
~~B~~hat, the only comment we received was -- on Proposal 40 is  
~~B~~hat Alaska Department of Fish & Game supports Proposal 40,  
~~y~~our proposal, and for that, I'll turn it over to Conrad to  
~~S~~hare any data that you would like.  
39  
40 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, I'll try to keep this one a  
~~A~~little bit simpler. This proposal deals with Unit 21(E ) and  
~~O~~ly that segment along the Innoko River. If you look at the  
~~M~~ap on page 11, which is the second page of this proposal, you  
~~C~~an see the amounts of Federal land on the Innoko River within  
~~U~~hat unit.  
46  
47 As you can see, there's the first parcel going up the  
~~R~~iver starting at Holy Cross on the Yukon River. The  
~~F~~irst parcel going up the river is a small block of BLM land on  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Both sides of the river. The next couple parcels probably are not within a half-mile corridor, but they came close to it, so I included them. The fourth parcel sits across a bend down the river, so it definitely does intersect the river corridor, and then there's really not another parcel that's on the river corridor for sure until you get onto the refuge on the very upper Innoko past Shageluk. So we're talking about a small amount of Federal land. We also have the same problem that we've had with other proposals since this is dealing with a river. Riverways are under State regulation and we have that whole problem with identifying Federal lands along waterways because they're not marked Federal lands.

13

14       Once you got onto the refuge, since it's a continuous block along the river, that would be easy to identify. The lower segments could be very difficult to identify if you're on off Federal lands.

18

19       The moose population in 21(E) is thought to be probably as high as it's ever been, and this is information published in ADFG publication by local managers.

22

23       Composition trend survey data tends to indicate that the moose population through 21(E) is stable. Cow:calf ratios are high. The last information that I had, the calf ratio was 46 calves per 100 cows. Bull ratios in 1990 were 28 bulls per 100 cows.

28

29       There's a study under way on the Upper Innoko River in the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge, and the preliminary indications of that study may be that within that area -- now, we don't know if it applies down the river at all because this study's very localized, that the moose population may be at or exceeding the winter-carrying capacity of the habitat. It's going to take a couple more years before they know that for sure.

37

38       This is primarily based on the number of moose in the highlands and the number of moose that's showing up in usable winter habitat down in the lowlands and the utilization of willows relative to areas that moose tend to concentrate in. They've not only flown that to identify actually the numbers of moose in those areas, but they've ground-toothed(ph) it during the summer and gone in and done browse studies, and they're finding in the areas used that, if I remember my figures correctly, I've got all that here if you're interested in it, approximately 75 to 80 percent of the browse was utilized in the areas that moose can use up there, and at the same time they're feeling that less than 80 percent of the moose had

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

moved out of the highlands because during the periods that they were running this, the snow depth had not been such that a lot of moose stayed up higher. They just didn't come down. This winter, if the snow is as deep up there as it is in some of the best of 20(E), this may be proof as to whether they were right in their preliminary assumptions. But this study's got a ways to go yet to verify that. But there's a possibility that the moose actually may be somewhere around their carrying capacity -- a winter-carrying capacity there.

10

11 The C&T for 21(E) is for residents of Russian Mission and residents of Unit 21(E), and that includes the three villages -- Anvik, Grayling, and Holy Cross -- within 24(E).

15

16 Again, I have reported moose harvest data, and again it points out -- we were discussing over the break how important it is to get reporting of moose harvest. The reported moose harvest from ADF&G's data base, over an eleven-year period during February, the season that we're talking about, was only ten moose. Only ten moose reported in eleven years on the Innoko River above the Yukon River -- the confluence with the Yukon River. That does not include that small segment down at the confluence, which is a high-density moose area with significantly higher harvest. But the Innoko above that point goes up through Unit 21(E) -- and we would assume that there's more moose taken there, but again, that's the best information I have.

29

30 Due to the limited amount of public lands, we -- and also the situation there, this probably will not have a significant impact on moose populations. Again, you may have better knowledge of this than I do, but it's been presented to me that if in those situations, particularly on the Upper Innoko, hunters were forced to move over a half-mile off of the river, that frequently that would eliminate most of the opportunity to harvest moose, and again, since Shageluk is the only village up there and apparently there's a winter concentration area right across from them, that it's also not on Federal land, they have access to moose in that area, for what that's worth.

42

43 That's basically all of the information I have. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to try to answer those. I have substantial harvest data information if that's of any value.

47

48 MR. GRAHAM: I guess I'm just wondering: On the State land, is there a half-mile corridor on the Yukon during the

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

February season?

2

3 MR. GUENTHER: I believe that there's a proposal to the  
Board of Game to create a half-mile corridor, but under the  
existing State regulations, there is not a corridor. In  
reality, there's no -- the moose population just is not -- in  
the small harvest, does not justify really limiting subsistence  
users to farther than a half-mile corridor off the river.

9

10 MR. GRAHAM: But you -- excuse me. But you say there  
is a State proposal to create a corridor? Is that what  
you're....

13

14 MR. GUENTHER: That's my understanding. I don't have a  
State Regulation Book with me and I really am not sure that  
that proposal is there. Can anybody....

17

18 MR. MATHEWS: There is -- your proposal was sent to the  
State Board to put a half-mile restriction, so this council has  
proposed to the State Board of Game the same half-mile  
restriction, if that's your question. In existing regulations,  
there isn't one. There isn't a half-mile restriction in State  
regulations for the unit in question, but there's a proposal  
from this council to have that, and if the Alaska Department of  
Fish & Game supports your Proposal 40, it sounds like they  
would support your Proposal 122 under the Board of Game.

27

28 MR. GUENTHER: That's correct.

29

30 MR. COLLINS: So passing this would then would -- if  
they pass the other one, there would be -- it would take care  
of all the land along there, Federal and State. We don't pass  
this, then we're going to have -- and they pass theirs, then  
we're going to have a mixed situation again.

35

36 MR. GUENTHER: To clarify that, from my information  
from ADF&G, they do support this, and so they will probably --  
probably the Board of Game will pass that proposal. If this  
proposal was also passed -- the Federal proposal was also  
passed, then what it would do -- first of all, the State -- if  
the State passes the proposal to close the half-mile corridor  
to all hunters except subsistence hunters on Federal land, if  
you pass this proposal also, it would close the half-mile  
corridor to all hunters.

45

46 MR. COLLINS: When we originally drew this up, I  
thought there was discussion about the islands in the Yukon.  
Wasn't that a discussion, too? One of the concerns? They  
wanted to -- they're so vulnerable for snow machine traffic and

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

So on. But I notice that it came out only the Innoko, but I thought it was to be both corridors.

3

4 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair? The proposal was presented  
5 a year ago to close the half-mile corridor along the Yukon. At  
6 the time when the board met last April, that proposal, since it  
7 affected Russian Mission on the Yukon Delta and the Yukon Delta  
8 Council had not met and discussed that proposal, the Federal  
9 Board said, "We will not make a determination on this proposal  
10 until the Yukon Delta Council acts on it." Then there was a  
11 special meeting called of the Yukon Delta Council. The Yukon  
12 Delta Council gave a recommendation. The board met last summer  
13 and passed the proposal to restrict hunting within a half-mile  
14 corridor of the Yukon River under Federal regulations. So  
15 you're correct. That has been brought up in the past and  
16 actions were taken on that.

17

18 MR. COLLINS: Okay.

19

20 MR. GUENTHER: Did I leave anything out?

21

22 MR. COLLINS: So this extends it to the Innoko River,  
23 Ben. Okay.

24

25 MR. GUENTHER: Did I leave anything out on that  
26 explanation, Vince, or did I cover it?

27

28 MR. MATHEWS: No, not -- no.

29

30 MR. GUENTHER: Okay.

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: That's already passed, that one, and at  
33 that time when you brought it up, you wanted to extend this to  
34 the Innoko. So it has passed the Federal Board on the Yukon.  
35 Now it's up on the Innoko River on both State and Federal  
36 boards.

37

38 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd defer to Henry on that.  
39 Do you have any comments? Is this what you wanted  
40 .... (pause)

41

42 MR. DEACON: (Nods head yes)

43

44 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any more discussion on Proposal 40?  
45 Nil?

46

47 MR. GRAHAM: It just seems like if we pass this we're  
48 taking away from opportunity for Shageluk to hunt moose in the  
49 winter. You're making it harder for them to hunt. Am I right

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

on that?

2

3 MR. DEACON: (Shakes head no)

4

5 MR. GRAHAM: No?

6

7 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is there a motion on the floor to  
adopt Proposal 40?

9

10 UNIDENTIFIED: I move.

11

12 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved to adopt Proposal 40.  
Is there a second?

14

15 MR. DEACON: Second.

16

17 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded to adopt  
Proposal 40. Question? (Pause) All in favor of the motion  
to adopt Proposal 40, signify by saying aye.

20

21 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

22

23 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)  
Motion carries. Proposal 40 is adopted.

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, based on your action on  
Proposal 40, would it be fair to say that you also support  
Proposal 122 before the Board of Game? Is that the will of the  
Council? (Pause) Okay. I'm seeing a lot of heads nodding,  
30....(pause)

31

32 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt 122.

33

34 MR. HUNTINGTON: The motion is on the floor to adopt  
Proposal 122. Is there a second?

36

37 MR. MORGAN: Second.

38

39 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded to adopt  
402. Question?

41

42 MR. MORGAN: Call for question.

43

44 MR. HUNTINGTON: The question has been called for. All  
45 favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

46

47 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

Motion carries. Proposal 122 adopted.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I talked to you  
4 earlier about proposals and I passed out a chart that had them  
5 asterisked or starred. Proposal 51 and 62, 64, and 65 affect  
6 your area because of C&T's that overlap regions. You don't  
7 have the analysis material in front of you on those, but I can  
8 provide you that information. So I need your direction of how  
9 to deal with these proposals. I kind of recommend bringing up  
10 the proposal, letting you know what it is, and then you could  
11 decide to take no action, table, or whatever. Oh, you do have  
12 an analysis for 51. I'm sorry. I'm ready, a step ahead. You  
13 do have in your red packet the analysis for 51, so I'll go  
14 ahead with that one. The other ones you don't.

15

16 Proposal 51 was from the Northwest Arctic Regional  
17 Council. It deals with Unit 23 caribou. It is requesting to  
18 change the harvest limit for caribou from five per day to  
19 fifteen per day. Comments on 51, there is two, and I'll also  
20 give you what the other regions had done on that since they've  
21 met. Proposal 51, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game is  
22 neutral. The Alaska Wildlife Alliance out of Anchorage, we  
23 oppose this proposal. Despite the large size of the herd,  
24 tripling the number of allowed kill per day is unwise and sets  
25 dangerous precedence. Five caribou per day is a reasonable  
26 opportunity. Fifteen caribou per day is wasteful and may  
27 create abuse. That was the justification for opposing it by  
28 the Alaska Wildlife Alliance.

29

30 The Northwest Arctic in its regional council meeting,  
31 they supported the proposal, it was their proposal, based on  
32 the fact that it would increase the fall hunt, and in fall they  
33 can use boats and the boats could handle the additional amounts  
34 of caribou taken.

35

36 The North Slope took it up at their meeting in Barrow.  
37 They took no action on Proposal 51.

38

39 And I'll then turn it over to other staff to -- if you  
40 would like additional information on caribou in Unit 23.

41

42 MR. HUNTINGTON: Jack, do you have a question?

43

44 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, we deliberated this  
45 proposal at the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource  
46 Commission, and we had testimony from -- well, there's a  
47 similar proposal from the Region 10 to increase the limit to  
48 ten caribou a day. The reasons that the local people were  
49 giving us for this proposal was that when the caribou are

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

migrating through an area, they may go through in a pretty rapid rate, and younger hunters that hunt for Elders are constrained by a five-caribou limit for getting a lot of caribou while they're going through in a short time period, and then not being able to put up enough caribou in a fast enough time frame. That was the reasoning that we heard at our meeting for the increase to fifteen in Unit 23 and ten in Unit 26, is to allow the higher take during the faster migration times, and it sounds like a lot, but they're actually killing a bunch of statistical data.

11

12 Anaktuvuk Pass shows that a lot of people don't hunt caribou there, Elders and stuff. I think it was over half of the people in the village don't hunt caribou, but everybody eats caribou. So there's people that have to kill a lot of caribou for other people, and this was what makes -- allows for that.

18

19 MR. HUNTINGTON: Conrad?

20

21 MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair, my report's quite brief. The Western Arctic herd is an extremely large herd, still growing. It's possibly in excess of a half-a-million animals right now. An increase by local subsistence users to fifteen animals a day or even more than that would probably not have any significant impact on the herd at this time. That's basically all I have unless you have some specific questions.

28

29 MR. MORGAN: I make a motion that we support this proposal.

31

32 MR. HUNTINGTON: Motion on the floor to support Proposal 51. Is there a second?

34

35 MR. DEACON: Second.

36

37 MR. MORGAN: Question.

38

39 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded to support Proposal 51. Any questions?

41

42 MR. MORGAN: Question.

43

44 MR. HUNTINGTON: Question's been called for. All in favor of support Proposal 51, signify by saying aye.

46

47 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

48

49 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause)

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515



Proposal 51 passes.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, the next one is --  
 4 well, give me direction. It's -- you have overlapping C&T  
 5 concerning caribou in Unit 26(A) and in Unit 26. There's three  
 6 proposals that deal with that. They're 62, 64 and 65. You  
 7 don't have the materials in front of you, but I can give you  
 8 background information on it.

9

10 Proposal 62, I can look up. What direction would you  
 11 like me to take on this? You have the C&T standing in that  
 12 area. We can provide you background on it or you can -- other  
 13 councils have felt that it's out of their direct area and  
 14 they'll take no action. Okay. Proposal 62 is from the City of  
 15 Anaktuvuk Pass. They would like the Federal lands south of the  
 16 Caldwell River upstream from and including the Anaktuvuk River  
 17 drainage, are closed to non-federally qualified subsistence  
 18 users from August 1st through September 30th. The reason for  
 19 changing this regulation is for caribou migration to take their  
 20 normal route into Anaktuvuk Pass. That's Proposal 62. I don't  
 21 have the comments that were received on that, but the North  
 22 Slope Regional Council supported that proposal and potentially  
 23 forwarding this proposal to the Board of Game. And that's  
 24 the information I have on 62.

25

26 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair? Steve Ulvi? It's my  
 27 recollection that the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource  
 28 Commission supported this Proposal 62 for -- and it was the  
 29 position of the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource  
 30 Commission to support that although their Federal lands are  
 31 more to the west, PET 4 and those lands to the west. But it  
 32 doesn't seem like that affects the western interior, but it  
 33 does. The Western Arctic caribou herd migrates through  
 34 Anaktuvuk Pass and those passes to the north, and it's the  
 35 opinion of the people in Anaktuvuk Pass that a lot of activity  
 36 to the north -- a lot of hunting pressure to the north of the  
 37 village deters migrations and deflects the migrations in other  
 38 areas, and so as a person from the western interior, I am in  
 39 favor of allowing the caribou to come over onto the south slope  
 40 of the Brooks Range and into the Unit 24 and to the south. So  
 41 I am -- as a member of the SRC, I also supported this Proposal  
 42 for those reasons.

43

44 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is there a possibility of maybe  
 45 merging all three of these proposals into one motion?

46

47 MR. GUENTHER: Um-hum (affirmative).

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: No, 64 is a little bit different. The

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

reason I'm bringing these up is to prevent the board then saying they can't take action on these proposals until they hear from the adjoining region that's affected. I don't want you to rush through them, but I'm just saying that's what I'm preventing happening here. 64 has to deal with harvest limits of ten per day, so that's a separate issue than closing Federal Lands. So we can't lump them together unless you want to lump them together and....

9

10 MR. HUNTINGTON: No, we're not lumping them together. We're just passing all at one time.

12

13 MS. MASCHMEYER: Instead of making three separate motions.

15

16 MR. DEACON: I move 61.

17

18 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, I see what you're saying. Sure. I can go ahead and give you information on 64 and 65, and then you could see if you want to adopt those as one group, sure. That -- okay. Okay. It's 62, 64, and 65. Okay. 64 was submitted by the North Slope Regional Council. It is to change the harvest limits for caribou in Unit 26 from five to ten caribou per day. Reasons for changing this: Customary and additional practice has allowed us to harvest more than five a day; also, it's impractical to go out hunting and have limited time. Caribou seem to be over-abundant in Unit 26. This would provide subsistence users to hunt more efficiently as well as to hunt according to customary and traditional practices.

30

31 That is Proposal 64. I don't have public comments, but the Northwest Regional Council took no action on it. The North Slope Regional Council amended this proposal, which they were the author of. They amended the proposal, a ten-caribou bag limit with no more than five exported and exempt Anaktuvuk Pass. I'm not saying that right, but essentially there's a restriction on exporting caribou from that unit, and they wanted that to be no more than five exported and then exempted Anaktuvuk Pass from that export. Maybe Dave can share more light on this 'cause he did attend the North Slope meeting.

41

42 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. Dave?

43

44 MR. YOKEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dave Yokel. As they amended the proposal, it would allow harvest limits of ten per day throughout GMU 26, but they would restrict export out of 26 to only five caribou per year to anywhere out of GMU 26 except to the village of Anaktuvuk Pass, and that would primarily affect GMU 26(B) where the Dalton Highway is, where

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

the harvest limit is currently five per year. For people that live south of the Pass there, that would keep it basically the same.

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The Proposal 65 is also Unit 26  
6 caribou, and that is to increase the -- well, it's submitted --  
7 I won't be able to pronounce that village. Hopefully someone  
8 else can help me.

9

10 UNIDENTIFIED: It's Ipikmiut(ph).

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: Oh. Ipikmiut Village, and they wanted to  
13 increase the daily harvest limit from five in Unit 26(A) to ten  
14 and in 26(B), from five to ten, and that's about all I can say  
15 on that. I have no public comments, but the only information I  
16 have is that Northwest took no action on that, and I don't know  
17 if North Slope took up 65. Dave may be able to share.

18

19 MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman? This proposal affects the  
20 same thing as Proposal 64. Since the North Slope Regional  
21 Advisory Council amended and adopted 64, they voted to take no  
22 action on Proposal 65.

23

24 MR. COLLINS: So it affects the same area then, you're  
25 saying, by adopting the one you don't need to....

26

27 MR. YOKEL: It's a different proposal for the exact  
28 same regulations.

29

30 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Yeah.

31

32 MR. HUNTINGTON: What's the board's wish on the  
33 proposals. Do you want to adopt them or just leave them the  
34 way they are or no action or....(pause)

35

36 MR. SIMON: I move to support Proposal 62, 64, and 65.

37

38 MR. HUNTINGTON: There's a motion on the floor to adopt  
39 Proposal 62, 64, and 65. Is there a second?

40

41 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

42

43 MR. HUNTINGTON: It's been moved and seconded to adopt  
44 Proposal 62, 64, and 65. Questions? Dave?

45

46 MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 64 and 65 contradict  
47 each other. It would send a conflicting message to the Federal  
48 Subsistence Board if you supported both of them.

49

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. COLLINS: I wonder if the board can drop 65 because  
 2 64 deals with the same issue.

3  
 4 MR. REAKOFF: I'm more in favor of 64.

5  
 6 MR. HUNTINGTON: Can you restate your motion?

7  
 8 MR. SIMON: Yeah.

9  
 10 MR. HUNTINGTON: You want to drop 65?

11  
 12 MR. MORGAN: You want to take no action on 65?

13  
 14 MR. SIMON: (Nods head yes)

15  
 16 MR. HUNTINGTON: There's a motion on the floor to adopt  
 17 62 and 64. Is there a second?

18  
 19 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

20  
 21 MR. HUNTINGTON: Second. It's been moved and seconded  
 22 62 adopt and support 62 and 64. Question?

23  
 24 UNIDENTIFIED: Question.

25  
 26 MR. HUNTINGTON: The question's been called for. All  
 27 27 favor to the motion signify by saying aye.

28  
 29 ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

30  
 31 MR. HUNTINGTON: All opposed, same sign. (Pause) The  
 32 motion carries. Proposal 62 and 64 adopted.

33  
 34 MR. MATHEWS: And then on 65, your action would  
 35 65....(pause)

36  
 37 MR. HUNTINGTON: No action.

38  
 39 MR. MATHEWS: No action? Okay. Mr. Chairman, just so  
 40 40m clear on 64, you're going with the proposal as written,  
 41 41rrect, not as amended?

42  
 43 MR. REAKOFF: As written.

44  
 45 MR. MATHEWS: As written?

46  
 47 MR. HUNTINGTON: As amended?

48  
 49 MR. REAKOFF: Was it -- oh, yeah. As amended.

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515

1  
2 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.  
3  
4 MR. REAKOFF: They amended it to five caribou export  
5 restriction.  
6  
7 MR. MATHEWS: So it's clear on the record, then your  
8 vote on 64 to adopt it was to adopt the amended proposal by the  
9 North Slope Council? (Pause) Good. Then we have both  
10 councils in agreement so we don't have to come back again on  
11 that one. Thank you.  
12  
13 Mr. Chairman, I know we are moving along here rapidly.  
14 I'd encourage any council member to look at that chart I put  
15 together if there's any other proposals that you want to  
16 discuss. You have gone through the ones that were specific to  
17 your region. You have gone through the ones that have  
18 overlapping C&T's. You have not addressed the ones that have  
19 what's considered a no determination. You don't have to. I'm  
20 just acknowledging on the record that you've been exposed to  
21 them.  
22  
23 MR. GRAHAM: Can we look at 53? It has our number on  
24 it.  
25  
26 MR. MATHEWS: Please?  
27  
28 MR. GRAHAM: Denali National Park? 53? Have we?  
29  
30 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. 53 -- I can bring up 53, correct.  
31 53 has to deal with Unit 20(C), which is not in your area of  
32 jurisdiction, but the C&T determination I have to look up. But  
33 let me look up the....  
34  
35 MR. COLLINS: Can the Eastern Interior take a position  
36 on that?  
37  
38 MR. MATHEWS: The Eastern Interior will be -- directly  
39 affects them, but the C&T determination I did look at during  
40 break. 20(C) moose is -- and the Park Service will probably be  
41 assisting on this one. Rural residents of Unit 20(C), except  
42 that portion within Denali National Park and Preserve and that  
43 portion east of the Totatlanika River and residents of  
44 Cantwell, Manley, Minto, Nenana, the Parks Highway from the  
45 Milepost 300 to 309, Nikolai, Tanana, Telida; no subsistence  
46 for residents of McKinley Village, the area along the  
47 Parks Highway between Milepost 216, 239, and households of  
48 Denali National Park Headquarters. That's the C&T for moose in  
49 Unit 20(C).  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 The Proposal 53, according to my notes, does apply to  
3 your region, but maybe the Park Service can shed some light  
4 that this may not apply to your region. Before I go into the  
5 details of it, 'cause once I go into the details of it, I know  
6 we're going to discuss the details.

7  
8 MR. TWITCHELL: Proposal Number 53 deals with hunting  
9 moose primarily, but other species as well, in the  
10 Kantishna Hills, which is located in Unit 20(C). The C&T for  
11 those in 20(C) does include two resident zone communities  
12 within the Western Interior Region, that being Nikolai and  
13 Telida. In looking at harvest information for those  
14 two communities this past year when we considered an  
15 alternative twenty moose hunt in Unit 20(C), there was no  
16 records indicating anyone from the villages of Nikolai or  
17 Telida had hunted moose in Unit 20(C) for the last, I think,  
18 fifteen years. We went back in harvest records. So the  
19 indication that we have, although Nikolai and Telida are both  
20 eligible communities for hunting within Denali National Park,  
21 that they have not been utilizing that authorization.

22  
23 Do you concur with that, Ray?

24  
25 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I concur with that. During the  
26 time -- I've been in the area for thirty years, and I've not  
27 known anybody to hunt up in that area from Telida, Nikolai,  
28 -- I don't know about Minchumina. I mean, I can't speak,  
29 but I know Nikolai and Telida, people haven't been that far in  
30 the last thirty years.

31  
32 MR. TWITCHELL: Minchumina is a community situated  
33 just to the west of the preserve and people in Minchumina do,  
34 indeed, utilize moose in Unit 20, although their use is  
35 primarily focused in a preserve area to the north and northwest  
36 of the Kantishna Hills.

37  
38 If you would like me to go into Proposal Number 53, I  
39 could do that. Otherwise, we plan to present that proposal to  
40 the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council.

41  
42 I guess I'll also go on record saying that the proposal  
43 was discussed by the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission at  
44 their meeting last Friday, and they voted to support the  
45 proposal Number 53 with one amendment to it, that being that  
46 the ending date for the closure for the Kantishna area be  
47 changed to September 12th instead of September 30th. Other  
48 than that, they voted to adopt that proposal. That's the  
49 information I'll carry to the Eastern Interior Region.

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any more discussion on Proposal 53?  
3(Pause) I'd like to recommend we take no action on it.

4  
5 MR. GRAHAM: Do we need a motion for that or just not  
6do anything?

7  
8 MR. HUNTINGTON: What's next on the -- that's about  
9it for proposals?

10  
11 MR. MATHEWS: Has that been moved and -- no action is  
12your -- okay. That's all the proposals unless some others that  
13Council or public that's in attendance would like the council  
14to look at. (Pause) Okay. Mr. Chairman, I know we're  
15rapidly trying to get to closure here, so I'm going to be quite  
16assertive here. A couple of things that I would like you to be  
17aware of is that I would like to be charged to draft a letter  
18from your council thanking the community of Huslia for this  
19hospitality and also that a letter be drafted complimenting and  
20thanking Cesa Sam for her tremendous amount of help on this  
21meeting. So if -- I'm taking your nodding of heads and it's on  
22the record that you're charging me to do that. Okay. Thank  
23you.

24  
25 The other thing is please make sure I get those  
26receipts. I don't like to have to chase you down to get money.

27  
28 The final thing is -- and again, this is not fair to do  
29this, so please stop me. You were given drafts of your  
30actions. Have you had a chance to look at those to make sure  
31the ones you were given reflect your actions? In particular, I  
32know you looked at the first one and I think you did well with  
33that. You felt it was reflective -- that was the one dealing  
34with the Northwest Arctic, the NARC Petition. The ones I want  
35make sure that are clear are the statement that Mr. Reakoff  
36had into the record and you agreed to have on the annual.  
37Have you had a chance to -- well, actually that one you adopted  
38on the record so I don't have to address that one. But did you  
39have a chance to look at his points of comment to the regional  
40Director of National Park Service concerning the Federal  
41Register notice and et cetera on same-day airborne? I'm not  
42asking you to change what was written. I'm asking you: Is  
43this what you're in agreement with? And Jack can go over them  
44again if you....(pause)

45  
46 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

47  
48 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, Jack?

49  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. REAKOFF: I'd like to clarify that this is not in  
 2 regard to same-day airborne. This is in regards to shooting of  
 3 free-ranging furbearers on the trapping license. Would you  
 4 like me to quickly read over these points on the record? I  
 5 have stated them before, but they wanted me to write them out,  
 6 and I stated the points of concern to be submitted to the  
 7 regional director.

8  
 9 MR. HUNTINGTON: What do the other council members  
 10 think on that? Do you want Jack to go ahead and read it or any  
 11 idea? Any directions?

12  
 13 MR. DEACON: I'd like to hear it.

14  
 15 MR. REAKOFF: Okay. "The subsistence users have  
 16 customarily and traditionally shot free-ranging furbearers  
 17 using a trapping license and regulations. A change to the  
 18 National Park Service definition indeed does change the bag  
 19 limits significantly. Point Three: The subsistence users, for  
 20 example, shot muskrats under the trapping regulations with a  
 21 22 rifle in spring camps whereas muskrat season was closed for  
 22 hunting. Point Four: It would take considerable time of the  
 23 regional councils to rectify the action of the National Park  
 24 Service as we, as council members, would have to change all the  
 25 hunting bag limits to reflect the customary and traditional  
 26 uses and the bag limits. This would cost the council and the  
 27 subsistence users, and the Federal Board program extensive  
 28 time, exceptional costs, and many trees of paper.

29  
 30 The hunting license expires December 31, whereas the  
 31 trapping license expires the following October 31 of the year  
 32 issued. This is to facilitate the trapper who goes out in the  
 33 early winter and stays all winter. He/she does not have to  
 34 come all the way out to relicense at great expense. Point Six:  
 35 It is the council's recommendation that the National Park  
 36 Service amend their definition to reflect the customary and  
 37 traditional uses." And that should be formulated into your  
 38 letter of comments to the regional director of the National  
 39 Park Service.

40  
 41 MR. MATHEWS: It sounds like that the council is in  
 42 agreement with his comments. Okay. Mr. Chairman, that brings  
 43 up to something I hope you can think about. Clearly, it's  
 44 where do you want time and place of next meeting, and you have  
 45 under Tab 1 a calendar showing you the window when you can  
 46 meet. And the window is from October 1, 1995 through  
 47 November 4th. I would recommend to you that we do similar that  
 48 we did with this meeting, but that if you could, move this  
 49 meeting to like starting on a Wednesday, do all day Thursday,  
 50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
 277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
 272-7515



and maybe depart on Friday or Thursday afternoon. Flights on Saturday are quite limited and it results in increased expenditures. So, I would recommend if you go with a Wednesday/Thursday type of scheme it would be really helpful.

5

6 MR. HUNTINGTON: What dates?

7

8 MR. MATHEWS: The dates are October 1st through November 4, and since you're the first one out of the chute for the two regions I work with, I would recommend you either go early in the season, the open window, or late so our staff can be wide awake and a little -- you know, we're going to have to leave this meeting and immediately get set up for one in Northway for three days. So, if we could get a gap between the 15th,....(pause). But it's up to you. And then where would you like to meet? You have met in Fairbanks, Galena, McGrath, and now here.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: Not in Fairbanks.

20

21 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: We never met in Fairbanks.

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, you never met in Fairbanks?

24

25 MR. COLLINS: McGrath, Galena, and here is the only three; twice in McGrath.

27

28 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. All right. I just have Eastern Interior on my mind.

30

31 MR. HUNTINGTON: Any recommendations from the board as to date and place of next meeting?

33

34 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

35

36 MR. HUNTINGTON: Jack?

37

38 MR. REAKOFF: I wonder what the cost -- what's the cheapest, most coverage we're going to get? What villages or towns are the cheapest to hold meetings in and to get the most public involvement?

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: Well, the cheapest, obviously, or most reasonable would be regional hub ones and that, but this council kind of conveyed to me that they like to get out and far from Huslia and et cetera. Well, Huslia is not really a hub community. So, yes, the most reasonable would be Galena, I suppose, as one of the hubs. Aniak is another hub and -- is there another hub? I'm not....

50

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. COLLINS: McGrath....  
3  
4 MR. MATHEWS: I don't want to....  
5  
6 MR. COLLINS: ....in terms of....  
7  
8 MR. MATHEWS: McGrath is another hub, so....  
9  
10 MR. COLLINS: ....from Anchorage.  
11  
12 MS. MASCHMEYER: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman? Hello,  
13 Hello?  
14  
15 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes, Gloria?  
16  
17 MS. MASCHMEYER: Thank you. I might want to mention,  
18 so, there was something else that came up at the C&T meeting  
19 and that is in order to expedite communications, you might want  
20 think about teleconferences as well. And just keep that in  
21 the back of your mind and if there's any way you can do that  
22 and possibly you could do that more often; maybe meet once a  
23 year face-to-face, but have more teleconferences in order to be  
24 closer contact with issues.  
25  
26 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, on that, I want to clarify  
27 that. I'm pretty sure you have to meet....  
28  
29 MS. MASCHMEYER: Twice.  
30  
31 MR. MATHEWS: You have to meet twice in a public  
32 location. What I think she's indicating is that if you wanted  
33 teleconference with other communities, we can pursue that  
34 and bring them into this meeting. Okay. You can leave it up  
35 me if you so desire, but I would feel a lot more comfortable  
36 and the staff would feel a lot more comfortable if you would at  
37 least select a community that you would like to go to, that you  
38 would desire to have their input.  
39  
40 MR. HUNTINGTON: Phil?  
41  
42 MR. GRAHAM: I don't know about where, but I'd rather  
43 have it toward the end of the window, maybe in the last week or  
44 two of October.  
45  
46 MR. HUNTINGTON: I'd like to suggest maybe we have it  
47 Aniak October 1st through the 3rd or 1st to the 4th or  
48 whatever that time -- early October, if it's okay with the  
49 host. Yeah, Pollock?  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1  
2 MR. SIMON: Yes, I'd like to suggest that we go to  
meetings within our region to different villages so that we  
could get -- a lot of villagers could see what we're doing and  
then, in turn, we would get their input and, for your  
information, that our local advisory committee on the State is  
scheduled between October 15 and 28th.

8  
9 MR. HUNTINGTON: What was that? October what?

10  
11 MR. SIMON: October 15th and 28th, we have scheduled  
our local advisory committee meeting.

13  
14 MR. HUNTINGTON: I couldn't hear you guys too good.

15  
16 MR. REAKOFF: The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee will  
meet up at Hughes on -- between the 15th of October and the  
28th of October.

19  
20 MR. COLLINS: That's out, you mean? Oh, unless we met  
in conjunction with them, you mean?

22  
23 MR. REAKOFF: Well, we're going to have it at Hughes,  
24 -- unless you want to go to Hughes. But I think,  
25 Chairman, that you're correct in designating Aniak because  
26 there's a lot of concerns from down in the lower river region  
27 and we haven't had any meetings down there.

28  
29 MR. HUNTINGTON: Is there a motion on the floor to have  
Aniak as our next place of meeting?

31  
32 MR. DEACON: Moved.

33  
34 MR. HUNTINGTON: Seconded to have Aniak as our next  
meeting and maybe we can come up with a date later on.

36  
37 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

38  
39 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, that  
40 does all the agenda other than maybe an Elder's comment or  
prayer, but I think we'll be dealing with that -- oh, I'm  
sorry. There is another....

43  
44 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I know that there's a draft  
45 for proposal they're doing October, you know -- I mean, there's  
46 proposal thing in October, you know, but I'd like to submit a  
47 draft proposal on wolf -- for bounty on wolves, you know, and  
48 have it sent to the different council members and they can get  
49 their comments on it and any suggestions on how they can

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 improve it or other information sources on this. So, maybe I  
2 could read like a proposal and they could type it up and send  
3 it out. Would that be possible?

4  
5 MR. HUNTINGTON: I don't think it'd do much good trying  
6 to read it right now. Too much noise right now.

7  
8 MR. MORGAN: Or if they have it in their hands, they  
9 could look it over and see if they can find any ways to improve  
10 it.

11  
12 MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, if you can make copies of it and  
13 send it to each board member, I think that would be better.

14  
15 MR. MORGAN: That'd be possible?

16  
17 MR. MATHEWS: My understanding is that you would want  
18 copies of your draft proposal dealing with wolves and that  
19 that....

20  
21 MR. MORGAN: No, I have a draft proposal here that I'd  
22 like the other council members to have to get any comments on  
23 we'll have it ready in October, you know.

24  
25 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Would you please give that copy to  
26 myself and I'll give you a copy back and then I'll get it typed  
27 up and sent to each one of you and then they are to contact you  
28 if they have comments. Correct?

29  
30 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, or if they have any ideas on how  
31 they can improve it.

32  
33 MR. MATTHEWS: Henry, did you have any -- your hand  
34 went up also. Either we could -- we could recess and meet  
35 after this or we can charge ahead.

36  
37 MR. DEACON: I just had a quick -- I want to know, you  
38 know, if the chairman here when he goes to other meetings like  
39 the Fish Board in Anchorage or Fairbanks, I'd like to see funds  
40 set aside for his expense.

41  
42 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Deacon, let's  
43 see, you withdrew the one proposal and what did you do with the  
44 other one? I'm drawing a blank. But, yes, there's funding to  
45 have the chair or council representative attend the Board of  
46 Game meeting. So, if you would like to have one go but you  
47 withdrew the one and the other one is still alive, so, yes, it  
48 would be worthwhile to send somebody. So, the chair....

49  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

1 MR. HUNTINGTON: I'd like my expenses covered.  
2  
3 MR. MATTHEWS: Right, they would be covered, correct.  
4  
5 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, the last two times they weren't  
6 covered. I had to pay out of my own pocket.  
7  
8 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. To the Board of Game, you mean?  
9  
10 MR. HUNTINGTON: No, the Federal Subsistence Board.  
11  
12 MR. MATHEWS: No, this would be to go to the Board of  
13 Game.  
14  
15 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, I'm talking about the Federal  
16 Subsistence Board, all....  
17  
18 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. That's another issue.  
19  
20 MR. HUNTINGTON: I think that's the same issue. It  
21 should be discussed, yeah.  
22  
23 MR. MATHEWS: So, if I understand the council, you do  
24 want to send a representative to the Board of Game and you're  
25 commending that the chair be that representative?  
26  
27 MR. DEACON: My suggestion is that he be compensated or  
28 paid his -- for going to meetings such as meeting, if so  
29 desired. If so desired to go, you know.  
30  
31 MR. MATHEWS:  
32  
33 MR. MATTHEWS: Yes, there's funding to compensate  
34 travel to the State Boards - that I checked on - if you have a  
35 proposal before the State Board. Correct, yes.  
36  
37 MR. HUNTINGTON: I'm talking about expenses. Not  
38 directly travel, but my expenses to attend the board meeting,  
39 you know, and I had to pay out of it twice -- out of my pocket  
40 twice already and I can't afford to do that too much longer.  
41  
42 MR. MATTHEWS: I hear your request, Mr. Chairman.  
43 There's a bit more to that....  
44  
45 MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, just relay it to the director  
46 and that'll be fine.  
47  
48 MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah, I'll relay it but there's a lot  
49 more details to it that I would rather not discuss. Okay.  
50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

That brings us up to the last one which you probably want to debate at great length and that would be No. 14 which would be adjournment. I would assume we need a lot of data on that one.

4

5 (General laughter)

6

7 MR. HUNTINGTON: I call the meeting -- the meeting is now adjourned.

9

10 MS. GURTLE-STRICK: No objection.

11

12 MR. HUNTINGTON: No objections. I'd like to make one statement before we close. I'd like to thank the people of Alaska for cooking and putting everybody up, and I'd really like to thank the Elders. I'm sure glad we came here for our meeting and we had great hospitality. Thank you.

17

18 Applause)

19 Off record; 6:15 o'clock p.m.)

20

21

\*\*\*\*\*

22

MEETING ADJOURNED

23

\*\*\*\*\*

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Elizabeth D'Amour, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

1 the best of my knowledge and ability;  
2

3 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party  
4 interested in any way in this action.  
5

6 DATED at Fairbanks, Alaska, this 1st day of March,  
7 1995.  
8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 5/12/98

S E A L

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET  
277-0572/Fax 274-8982

1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE  
272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501